Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-131
Tuesday
9 July 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-131 9 July 1991

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Commentary Views Bush Message to Gorbachev *[Moscow International]* 1
Delegation Outlines Conventional Arms Position *[TASS]* 1
U.S. Inspectors Arrive in Kiev Military District *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Foreign Ministry Holds Press Briefing 2
Gorbachev Message to Walesa Denied *[TASS]* 2
Bessmertnykh-Baker Meeting *[TASS]* 2
Arms Sales Experts Meeting *[TASS]* 2
Roundup on Briefing *[TASS]* 2
START, Summit Delays Explained *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jul]* 3
Gorbachev To Meet Kaifu in London 17 Jul *[TASS]* 3
Japan's Position on Aid to Moscow Examined *[PRAVDA 29 Jun]* 4
Asia-Pacific Cooperation Progress Viewed *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 5
Bessmertnykh on Warsaw Pact, Security Issues *[IAN PRESS RELEASE]* 6
Deraybin on CSCE Discussions on Yugoslavia *[INTERFAX]* 7
'World This Week' on G-7 Meeting, Cambodia *[Moscow Radio]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gerasimov Supports McNamara Arms Cuts Call *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 26]* 9

Northeast Asia

Solomon's Views on DPRK Nuclear Issue Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 9
DPRK Official Violates Customs Regulations *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 3 Jul]* 10
DPRK's Welcome of ROK Investment Examined *[Moscow Radio]* 10
Commentator Views DPRK-ROK Summit Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 11
Vladivostok Symposium on Ties With Japan Closes *[INTERFAX]* 11

Near East & South Asia

PLO 'Ready To Accept' 'Curtailed' Conference *[INTERFAX]* 12
Indian Premier Thanks Gorbachev for Message *[PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 12
Iranian Air Force Commander Arrives for Talks *[Teheran TV]* 12

East Europe

USSR, Bulgaria To Formulate Treaty on Ties *[TASS]* 13
Foreign Ministry Officials on Kvitsinskiy Trip *[INTERFAX]* 13
Deraybin Statement on Yugoslavia, CSCE *[INTERFAX]* 13
Correspondent on Yugoslav, EC Relations *[INTERFAX]* 13
Soviet, Polish Experts Elaborate Draft Treaty *[TASS]* 14
Lukyanov Receives Islami-Led Albanian Delegation *[TASS]* 14
Nishanov, Katushev Meet Group *[TASS]* 14
Yanayev, Islami Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 15
Gorbachev, Islami Meet *[TASS]* 15

Albanian Official on Visit *[TASS]* 15
Islami Interviewed *[TASS]* 15
Treaty To Be Drafted *[INTERFAX]* 16
Albania's Alia Comments on Kosovo Situation *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jul]* 16
Soviet Expert Comments on Economic Talks *[NEPSZABADSAG 27 Jun]* 16
IZVESTIYA Notes Hungarian Statement *[2 Jul]* 17

West Europe

Spain's Gonzalez Visits Moscow 17
Preview of Visit *[TASS]* 17
Gorbachev Welcomes Gonzalez *[TASS]* 18
Bessmertnykh Meets Fernandez-Ordonez *[TASS]* 18
Bessmertnykh Talks to Reporters *[TASS]* 18
Bessmertnykh on Soviet-Spanish Talks *[TASS]* 19
Gonzalez Speaks on Democracy *[TASS]* 19
Gonzalez Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 20
Gorbachev Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 22
Pavlov, Gonzalez Discuss Reforms, Ties *[TASS]* 23
Friendship, Cooperation Treaty *[TASS]* 23
Gorbachev-Gonzalez Talks *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 23
More on Gorbachev, Kohl Press Conference *[PRAVDA 6 Jul]* 25

Latin America & Caribbean

Further on Visit of Mexico's President Salinas 27
Joint Declaration Issued *[PRAVDA 6 Jul]* 27
Concludes Visit, Departs 5 Jul *[TASS]* 30

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Compliance Committee Approves Union Treaty *[TASS]* 31
Gorbachev Proposes Bankruptcy Bill *[INTERFAX]* 31
Bill Approved at First Reading *[TASS]* 31
Political Rehabilitation Bill Debated *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Bill Approved at First Reading *[TASS]* 32
Pugo Reports Worsening Situation in NKAO *[TASS]* 32
Katushev Rejected as Deputy Prime Minister *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Supreme Soviet 8 July Proceedings *[Moscow TV]* 33

Political & Social

Gorbachev, Yeltsin Interviewed on G-7 Agenda *[Moscow TV]* 34
'Vesti' Views Novo-Ogarevo 8 July Meeting *[Moscow Russian TV]* 35
Gorbachev's Program for London Trip Approved *[Moscow TV]* 35
Cabinet of Ministers Moves From Kremlin Offices *[Moscow Radio]* 35
Oversight Committee Views Treaty, Economic Crime *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jul]* 35
Soyuz Official Criticizes Draft Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 36
Workers Urge Revision of Privatization Law *[INTERFAX]* 36
Deputies Group Urges Support for Reform Movement *[INTERFAX]* 36
Democratic Platform Official on Reforms *[Budapest NEPSZABADSAG 5 Jul]* 37
Seleznev Commentary Views New Reform Movement *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 38
Youth Paper Reaction to 'Democratic Movement' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 39
Commentary Identifies Three 'Currents' in CPSU *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jul]* 41
Official on Need for Third Political Force *[INTERFAX]* 43
Nationalities Commission Debates Kurd Problems *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jul]* 43
MVD On Latest Provisions of Emigration Law *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 44
Relative of Last Czar To Be Canonized *[INTERFAX]* 45
TASS Reviews 9 July Press 45

Economic

Deficit Could Lead To 'Financial Catastrophe' *[Radio Rossii]* 45
Deadline for Exchange of Banknotes Expires *[TASS]* 45
Public Polled on Food-Buying Habits *[INTERFAX]* 46
Economic Expert on Soviet Economy, Cooperation *[NEPSZABADSAG 4 Jul]* 46
Latvian Premier Sees More Economic Deterioration *[INTERFAX]* 47
Estonian Delegation Visits Urals, Siberia *[BALTFAX]* 47

Agricultural

'Vremya' Analyzes Agricultural Problems *[Moscow TV]* 48

Military

Statute on Military Councils Published *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]* 48
Shlyaga on Changes to Military Councils *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Jul]* 49
Soviet Generals Likened to Chicago Mafia *[Radio Rossii]* 51
Two Servicemen Kill, Wound 13 in Zolotinka *[INTERFAX]* 52
Superiority of Yak-141 Military Aircraft Cited *[Moscow International]* 52

BALTIC REPUBLICS

Zbigniew Brzezinski Pays Visit to Baltics 53
Meets Estonian Premier *[BALTFAX]* 53
On Settlement of Baltic Issue *[BALTFAX]* 53
Document on Economic Losses of Secession *[BALTFAX]* 53

Estonia

Official Urges Tougher Stand With USSR *[BALTFAX]* 53

Lithuania

Landsbergis Supports Slovenia, Croatia *[BALTFAX]* 54
Lithuanian Opposition's Problems Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Jul]* 54

RSFSR

Yeltsin Visit to Novosibirsk Continues *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 3 Jul]* 56
Backs Siberian Development *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jul]* 57
Yeltsin Holds Talks With Spanish Prime Minister *[TASS]* 57
Yeltsin: Draft Union Treaty a 'Good Foundation' *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 57
Leadership Urges Support of Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 57
Udmurtiya Approves Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Tatarstan Approves Draft *[TASS]* 58
Karelia Approves Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Silayev Interviewed on Democratic Reform Movement *[Radio Rossii]* 58
Ready To Join *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 59
Parliament Backs Silayev on Dispute With Union *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Jul]* 59
Khasbulatov on Role of RSFSR Supreme Soviet *[Radio Rossii]* 60
National Impact of Presidential Election Viewed *[NOVOYE VREMYA No. 25]* 61
Zhirinovskiy Expects Power 'Very Soon' *[TASS]* 62
Measures Adopted To Increase Grain Supplies *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Russian Law on Foreign Investment Passed *[INTERFAX]* 63
Foreign Minister Cited on London G-7 Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 63
State of Emergency Lifted in Makhachkala *[TASS]* 63
Democratic Support Deserts Mayor Sobchak *[PRAVDA 29 Jun]* 63
Disaster Relief Rescue Corps Established *[MOSCOW NEWS No. 24]* 64

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Moldova

Snegur on Romanian Ties, Independence Issue *[TINERETUL LIBER 3 Jul]* 65
Legislators Approve Privatization Law *[TASS]* 65

Ukraine

First Presidential Election Set for 1 Dec *[TASS]* 66
Fokin Rejects State Property Draft Agreement *[Kiev Radio]* 66
Parliament Rejects Romanian Territorial Claims *[TASS]* 66
Deputy Explains Union Laws Abolishment *[Kiev International]* 66
Illegal Export of Products From Ukraine Exposed *[PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 67

CAUCASUS

Georgia

S. Ossetian Panel Hold News Conference *[Tbilisi Radio]* 68
Army Paper on Gamsakhurdia 'Blockade' Claim *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Jul]* 68

Armenia

Supreme Soviet Discusses Renewed Clashes *[TASS]* 68
Gorbachev Blamed for Interethnic Conflicts *[TASS]* 68
Supreme Soviet Criticizes Army Action *[Moscow Radio]* 69
Kryuchkov Warned of Planned Action Against OMON *[TASS]* 69
Azerbaijani Plans To Deport Armenians Noted *[INTERFAX]* 69
KGB Remarks on Passport Checks 'Lame Excuse' *[INTERFAX]* 70

Azerbaijan

Four Azerbaijanis Killed in Nagorno-Karabakh *[TASS]* 70
Azeri OMON Enters Shaumyan District *[INTERFAX]* 70

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakh, Tajik Presidents Discuss Union Treaty *[PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 72
Authoritarian Trends in Central Asia Discussed *[MOSCOW NEWS No. 24]* 74
Mufti Removed From Central Asian Muslim Board *[INTERFAX]* 75

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Briefs Journalists on Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 75
Nazarbayev Advocates Direct Loans to Republics *[Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT 8 Jul]* 76

Commentary Views Bush Message to Gorbachev

LD0807153391 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] In his message to President Gorbachev, President Bush expresses the hope that the Soviet-American agreement on cutting strategic offensive weapons will be ready by the end of this month. Commentary is by (Yevgeniy Khrushkin):

Speaking at Camp David, President Bush said that aims of his message were to bring closer the two countries' positions on the issues still unsolved in the agreement. The talks in Geneva have been going on for several years and both the Soviet Union and the United States have made it clear they want to bring them to a successful conclusion, believing quite rightly that an agreement will considerably lower the level of military confrontation and improve relations between their two countries and the world situation as a whole, and could prove a breakthrough in disarmament. Today the two countries possess arsenals of nuclear strategic weapons way beyond reasonable defence sufficiency. Experts believe just a few percent of this would ensure strategic stability, so common sense says the arsenals must be reduced.

Much has been done at the talks in Geneva. All matters of principle have been settled, but issues pertaining to forms and methods of control remain unsolved. The West blames the Soviet Union for this delay and even claims military circles are exerting even more influence on Soviet Foreign policy. Soviet military leaders in turn accuse the United States of trying to secure certain advantages in Geneva. Such claims and accusations should not be exaggerated. Negotiations always require comprehensive discussion and the more so if they concern cuts in strategic offensive weapons, since these determine the strategic balance, to say nothing of the economic, political and military concerns of the two countries.

Any mistake could damage the stability the two sides are striving for. What is important is readiness on the part of each to understand the doubts and arguments of the other and to meet each other halfway. If the two sides are able to show this readiness the talks should come to a close fairly soon, comments (Yevgeniy Khrushkin).

Delegation Outlines Conventional Arms Position

LD0407191391 Moscow TASS in English 1857 GMT 4 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna July 4—Limitation of personnel of the countries participating in the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe were in the focus of attention of a regular plenary meeting of that forum today. Several months ago the Soviet delegation set out its viewpoint on this problem, and now Western partners at last expressed their readiness to join in this work.

Preliminary debates have shown that there are many points of contact on a number of important aspects of the matter. There is an agreement in principle regarding the basis on which the agreement should be worked out: national, collective, or taking into consideration both aspects.

The sides believe that personnel reductions could be made on the basis of national limitations for each participating state. This is a logical approach. Only in this way national peculiarities of the forming of armed forces, their training and the ensurance of enternal security can be taken into consideration more fully and painlessly. In addition, there will be no temptation to apply some common scheme to national levels which would most probably lead the negotiations into an impasse.

A complex work to draft an agreement limiting the forces personnel is ahead. The Soviet delegation believes that the following principles should be observed in this work.

First, the agreement should be easily implemented, which means that it must be streamlined in form and readily understandable in contents, that it should take into consideration the realities that formed in the recent years in Europe, including the elimination of the military organisation of the Warsaw Treaty and Soviet troop withdrawal from East European countries.

Second, it should be linked with the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe, should take into consideration many of its provisions, including the exchange of information, verification, levels of arms limitations.

Third, the agreement should be flexible enough so that there should be no need for radical changes in the practice of ensuring external and internal security in separate countries.

A number of countries made proposals for personnel limitation at today's meeting.

U.S. Inspectors Arrive in Kiev Military District

LD0607175691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1717 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jul (TASS)—It has been officially reported here today that on 1 July 1991, in accordance with the articles laid down in the Vienna document of 1990 on confidence-building measures and security in Europe, the Government of the United States made a request to the Soviet Union on evaluating information about military forces and plans for the deployment of basic weapons systems and equipment in the 110th Motor-Rifle Guards Regiment of the Kiev military district.

The U.S. request to carry out this inspection of the situation has been agreed to.

Today, U.S. representatives arrived on the territory of the Kiev military district and have started work.

Foreign Ministry Holds Press Briefing

Gorbachev Message to Walesa Denied

LD0807144291 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin today denied Polish press and Western Wire Service reports that President Mikhail Gorbachev conveyed a message to Polish President Lech Walesa, indicating change in the Soviet stance on the security formula in the inter-state Soviet-Polish treaty now being drafted.

Walesa allegedly received the message in Prague during the recent meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee.

"No message from Mikhail Gorbachev to Lech Walesa was conveyed in Prague," Churkin said. "Provisions of this sort, regarding bilateral treaties, are not considered in a message to Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel either."

Bessmertnykh-Baker Meeting

LD0807144891 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—A working meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Alexander Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will be held in Washington on July 11-12, in keeping with an arrangement made between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

Main attention during the meeting will be devoted to the state of affairs at the talks on reductions in strategic offensive arms, Churkin emphasised.

The Soviet foreign minister will be accompanied during the trip by General of the Army Mikhail Moiseyev, Chief of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff, and by Deputy Foreign Minister Alexey Obukhov, the spokesman added.

The Soviet Union expects that the forthcoming meeting will help stimulate work during the concluding stage of the preparation of a Soviet-U.S. strategic arms reduction treaty, Churkin said.

Arms Sales Experts Meeting

LD0807151691 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 8 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—The Soviet Union intends to take an active part in the first meeting of experts delegated by the five U.N. Security Council permanent member-countries to Paris to discuss restrictions on arms sales and their non-proliferation, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaly Churkin told a news conference here today.

According to Churkin, the USSR believes that a way to solve the problem of restricting arms supplies can be found only on the basis of joint efforts by states, by ensuring the balance of their interests, observing the principle of security of the sides and transferring from excessive armaments to the sensible defence sufficiency, as well as consolidating global security and stability and eradicating the sources of regional tensions.

Churkin noted that the Soviet Union proceeds from the expectation that the first meeting of experts from five countries will be constructive in nature and enable the world community to lay a sound basis for further steps towards restricting international arms sales, as well as to gain a better understanding of approaches to non-proliferation problems.

Roundup on Briefing

LD0807173191 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—As agreed by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush a working meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Alexandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will be held in Washington on July 11-12, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaly Churkin told a briefing here today.

The meeting will focus on the situation around strategic arms reduction treaty negotiations. The Soviet foreign minister will be accompanied on his trip by Soviet Chief of Staff of Armed Forces General Mikhail Moiseyev and Deputy Foreign Minister Alexey Obukhov.

The Soviet Union counts on the forthcoming meeting to energize work at the closing stage of the Soviet-American START treaty preparations.

The Soviet spokesman told journalists in detail about Spanish Premier Felipe Gonzalez' visit to the Soviet Union. He said that today Felipe Gonzalez met Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and is expected to meet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov.

Also today, Soviet Foreign Minister Alexandr Bessmertnykh held talks with Spanish Foreign Minister Fernandez Ordonez. The ministers praised the active Soviet-Spanish political dialogue and the state of relations in different fields. Ordonez extended an invitation to Alexandr Bessmertnykh to pay an official visit to Spain. The invitation was received with gratitude, the time of the visit will be decided through diplomatic channels.

Churkin said that on Tuesday, July 9 the Soviet-Spanish treaty of friendship and cooperation is to be signed to open wide prospects for a dialogue of partners and interaction between the two countries. The treaty will place Spain among the Soviet Union's main-line partners in Europe.

The Soviet Union is making vigorous efforts to help normalize the situation in Yugoslavia by democratic, political and peaceful means along with the leading bodies of the conference for security and cooperation in Europe and other countries, the Soviet spokesman said.

The extraordinary meeting of the CSCE senior officials in Prague from July 3-5 devoted to the situation in Yugoslavia marked the beginning of operations of the mechanism for consultations and cooperation in emergencies, which was created at the Berlin meeting of the CSCE Council of Foreign Ministers.

Churkin noted the importance of documents adopted in Prague: the call for a ceasefire in Yugoslavia and the strict adherence to the principle of non-use of force, the recommendation to send a mission to assist stabilization efforts and the decision to send a good services mission to Yugoslavia. All these documents were adopted with the active participation of the Soviet delegation. The Soviet delegation proceeded from the fact that Yugoslavia supported the proposal to convene the committee of CSCE senior officials, all decisions were made with its consent and the missions will be sent at the invitation of Yugoslav authorities and act in close cooperation with them.

In this context, the Soviet side particularly stressed the Helsinki principle of non-interference into internal affairs, specially singled out in the Berlin procedures for emergency situations.

"Therefore", the Soviet spokesman said, "the situation and the character of decisions made in Prague cannot be viewed as a general precedent for the future".

Churkin told journalists about the trip to Yugoslavia from July 6 by the Soviet President's special envoy, First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Kvitsinsky. The envoy has been to Belgrade, where he held a number of talks. His trip, which is expected to last until July 9, includes also Slovenia and Croatia.

Head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's International Humanitarian Cooperation Directorate Yuriy Reshetov, who spoke within the framework of the briefing, told journalists about the Soviet parliament's decision, made on July 5, under which the Soviet Union becomes a member of the optional protocol to the international pact on civil and political rights and some other international legal conventions.

He noted that the Soviet Union has now joined all the most important control mechanisms that exist at the level of universal conventions in this field.

START, Summit Delays Explained

PM0807223791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[Unattributed report on news conference by Vitaliy Churkin, Foreign Ministry Information Administration chief, under the general heading: "'Technical Details' or 'Substantive Problems'?"]

[Text] The Soviet position on the talks on the reduction of strategic offensive arms was set out the other day at a briefing by Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration. We now cite his comments on this topic.

In the past few days another round of intensive efforts by Soviet and U.S. top-level negotiators ended in Geneva, where conversations took place between the USSR deputy foreign minister and the U.S. under secretary of state. Although no dramatic breakthroughs were achieved, nonetheless, it seems that some useful work was done.

I would like to explain that the problem involves the remaining three areas of technical problems which have still to be resolved for the conclusion of a treaty constitute a package. Therefore, until all the many technical details have been settled it cannot be said that these questions have been fully resolved. In other words, at the moment we cannot say that these problems have been fully resolved but both sides expressed certain ideas which, in our opinion, help matters to progress.

Now Under Secretary R. Bartholomew and Deputy Minister A.A. Obukhov are returning. Clearly, further reflections are needed. This is the conventional working process. The additional study of questions will, we believe, make it possible to achieve further progress and ultimately lead to the completion of the elaboration of the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms. If that happens in the next few weeks the Soviet-U.S. summit will take place at the end of July. The days and weeks ahead will show whether that is actually going to happen.

Gorbachev To Meet Kaifu in London 17 Jul

LD0507213691 Moscow TASS in English 2132 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—It has been officially announced here that, in accordance with the agreement, a working meeting between Soviet President Mikhail

Gorbachev and Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu will be held in London on July 17.

Japan's Position on Aid to Moscow Examined

PM0307113191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 91 Second Edition p 6

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "View from Moscow" article: "The G-7, Perestroyka, and Tokyo"]

[Text] Ever since Japan began taking part in the annual meetings of the "big seven," it has always been particularly afraid of finding itself in a "six against one" situation, that is, of finding itself isolated from the rest. Ever since a tripolarity of economic might appeared in the capitalist world—the United States, West Europe, and Japan—Tokyo's main concern has been to prevent a unification of its rivals, each of whom is to some extent displeased with Japan's trade expansion.

To this end Japan has successfully used a tried and tested scheme at many G-7 meetings: It would get in before the rest to support Washington in the military-political aspects of its confrontation with Moscow, thereby pushing into the background the trade and economic contradictions between the Land of the Rising Sun and its rivals. With the ending of the cold war, this conventional method has lost its effectiveness. But the fear of isolation has remained.

That is why Japan insisted on a ministerial-level dress rehearsal of the July meeting of the heads of state and government to compare opinions on the main topic of the forthcoming discussions: Help for the reforms in the Soviet Union. Japan has the greatest financial potential for that. But it is adopting the most negative stance on this question.

The reason for that is the principle of the "inseparability of politics and economics" or, more simply, Moscow's refusal to satisfy Tokyo's territorial claims. Admittedly, so as not to set the rest against themselves unduly, Japan's leaders decided this time not to seek a special mention of the transfer of the "Northern Territories" in the final document as a prior condition for economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. A different and outwardly attractive formula has been chosen to conceal that demand: For the G-7 to support perestroyka, the Soviet Union must extend the policy of the new thinking to the Asia and Pacific region as well (and in particular to surrender to Japan the islands it requires).

Japanese official circles have long been saying that Moscow's consistent steps in military detente have still not been felt in Asia and the Pacific region. They seem not to have noticed that the USSR Armed Forces east of the Urals have been reduced by 200,000 men, the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Mongolia is being completed, our military presence at Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay is being scaled down, intermediate- and shorter-range missiles are being scrapped in the Asian part of the country, and the number of other nuclear weapon delivery vehicles there is not being increased.

In Tokyo there have been no responses to Moscow's calls to use the European experience of elaborating confidence-building measures in the military sphere. The proposal to begin tripartite Soviet-Japanese-U.S. consultations to remove the mutual concerns has gone unanswered. But perhaps the most recent and specific example is especially telling.

Recently Japan was officially invited to send military observers to the USSR Pacific Fleet exercises scheduled for mid-August. In 1989, the Japan National Defense Agency turned down a similar invitation. Judging from the long silence, that will most likely be the response this time, too. The alleged reason for this is that until the "Northern Territories" problem is resolved it is too soon to develop ties between the military. An affirmative answer, MAINICHI explains, would make it necessary to invite Soviet observers to Japanese maneuvers. But such contacts would strengthen mutual confidence and thus undermine the thesis of the "qualitative buildup of the Soviet military potential in the Far East."

Here is another example. In a show of goodwill in April, the USSR president proposed that the Japanese be free to visit the Southern Kuril Islands without visas. However, the Japanese foreign minister allowed visa-free travel only to journalists and former inhabitants of the islands. The reason for the limitation is that to accept the Soviet initiative in full would mean "undermining the movement for the return of the Northern Territories." It turns out that the steps designed to strengthen confidence and create an atmosphere of good-neighborliness are being rejected precisely because of their positive thrust. In that case to whom should one address the call to "extend the new political thinking to the Asia and Pacific region"?

But let us return to the dress rehearsal for the July G-7 meeting—the conference of finance ministers and chairmen of the seven states' central banks. The vague wording of the final document does not make it possible to draw conclusions about the course of the discussion in London. Its only obvious result is the agreement of the participants to admit the Soviet Union to the IMF as an associate member. Such status makes it possible to give unimpeded "technical assistance" to the reforms in the USSR but does not give Moscow access to massive Western financial support.

Now the discussion of that topic will be continued in the United States on 11 July, where the U.S. President will meet with the Japanese prime minister before flying to London. Prime Minister Kaifu insisted on a preliminary meeting with Bush for fear of isolation because Germany, France, and Italy are adopting a more constructive stance on the question of support for Soviet perestroyka. So as not to be left isolated, according to the newspaper ASAHI, Kaifu will work to ensure that "Washington is in step with Tokyo."

Official circles in Tokyo have long said that, until the problem of the "Northern Territories" has been resolved, the Japanese Government will not agree to the expansion of bilateral economic cooperation or large-scale financial assistance for the reforms in the USSR. Is such an approach farsighted? Not to mention the fact that solutions to such painful problems as territorial demarcation can be found only in an atmosphere of trust and mutual goodwill. But in this instance it is not only a question of bilateral affairs. The USSR president's invitation to the next meeting of the "big seven" may open a qualitatively new stage in East-West cooperation and collaboration and breach the barriers blocking the establishment of the new world order. So why should Japan oppose that tendency and isolate itself from the rest, something which it always feared so much at previous meetings of the "big seven"?

Asia-Pacific Cooperation Progress Viewed

PM020715519l Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov article: "Europe Plus Asia"]

[Text] Now, on the threshold of a new century and a new millennium, it is important that mankind does not miss a major opportunity: An opportunity to accomplish the difficult transition to a new world order, which must be based not on a balance of forces but on a balance of interests, not on advantage at the expense of others but on compromise through accord, not on claims to leadership but on respect for equality; a new world order where specific features and differences can serve as incentives for healthy competition and factors of progress.

These thoughts, expounded by M.S. Gorbachev in his Nobel lecture, prompt an examination of global and regional problems from the standpoint of the greatest challenge of our age—how to work together to create a single, international, democratic space which reflects the values and interdependence of the modern world.

The European process can be considered the source, ferment, and catalyst of this historic matter. Although formally restricted to geographical borders "from the Atlantic to the Urals," this process actually embraces part of the USSR and stretches across the Atlantic to the United States and Canada, laying the foundation for a single zone of security and cooperation in the Northern Hemisphere. (Speaking a few days ago in Berlin, Secretary of State Baker called this zone the "Euroatlantic Community from Vancouver to Vladivostok.")

Of course, the issue is not about consolidating one part of the planet to counterbalance another, or supporting the North against the South. In fact, the issue at hand is the use of the European process to stimulate movement toward a new peaceful period of universal history, and toward new relations and values for mankind.

It is clear now that the process born in Helsinki has become irreversible. Can Europe's example prompt some kind of reaction in Asia? Many political experts reply to this question in the negative, referring to the differences in local conditions. It is indisputable that the Helsinki scheme cannot be mechanically transferred onto Asian soil. Specific Asian features demand different approaches. The quest for such approaches has begun.

It is for the sake of this that the Soviet Union revitalized its foreign policy "in every sphere" during the perestroyka years. The guidelines laid down in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk help to focus attention on its eastern dimension. This year, two major events occurred in this area. In April, there was the first visit to Japan by a head of our state. And in May, for the first time since 1957, China's top leadership visited our country.

Agreements on the eastern section of the state border between the USSR and the PRC and on the principles for mutual armed forces reductions in the border regions open up prospects for transforming the interstate border, which is 7,500 km long, into a good-neighborly zone. This serves as the first practical step toward military detente in the Asia-Pacific region, and sets a good example for others. The experience of border settlements gained by Moscow and Beijing has attracted the attention of India, which has similar problems with China. In my opinion, it could also prove instructive in matters of territorial demarcation between Japan and the USSR.

The Moscow joint communique states that the Soviet Union and China attach great significance to security and stability in the Asia-Pacific Region and are prepared to join forces to transform this region into a zone of openness, cooperation, and development. According to the Japanese newspaper ASAHI SHIMBUN, the wording reflects first and foremost support for Moscow's Asian initiatives by Beijing, which reacted to such initiatives with tense restraint in the past.

Tokyo's attitude to the Vladivostok-Krasnoyarsk initiative has altered somewhat for the better. At first, Japanese official circles stated: Indeed, before beginning something akin to the Helsinki Process in Asia, it is necessary to settle regional conflicts and disputes, including the problem of the "Northern Territories."

I think that the very dynamism of political processes in the Asia-Pacific region prompted Tokyo to alter this stance. The joint Soviet-Japanese statement, signed during the USSR president's April visit, is proof of this. It reads: "The sides expressed consonant views on the importance of extensive dialogue and contacts on a wide range of issues, including aspects of guaranteeing security, from the point of view of further ensuring peace and development in the Asia-Pacific region."

Moscow's practical steps toward military detente in the region did not go unnoticed in Asia. In the Asian part of the USSR, the elimination of short- and medium-range nuclear missiles is nearing completion and the quantity of other nuclear systems delivery vehicles has remained

stagnant for five years. The numerical strength of armed forces east of the Urals has dropped by 200,000. The withdrawal of our troops from Mongolia is almost ended, the use of facilities in Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay is declining. The Soviet Union will continue reducing its military presence in the Asia-Pacific Region. This process would progress even faster if other naval powers were to reciprocate these gestures.

In Tokyo, Gorbachev expressed readiness to begin three-way Soviet-Japanese-U.S. consultations in order to eradicate mutual concerns. The issue here is not about creating some kind of permanent structure, some kind of mechanism for multilateral cooperation. The issue is about consultation, joint declarations, the discussion of common problems, and prompt warnings about common dangers. This kind of consultative approach is the basis of the Soviet proposal to hold a meeting of foreign ministers from all Asia-Pacific region countries in 1993. Speaking in the Japanese parliament, the Soviet leader also submitted another important initiative: To begin by holding five-party meetings between the USSR, the United States, the PRC, India, and Japan, mainly to compare the positions of the region's great powers and thus to stimulate the collective quest for paths toward trust and collaboration.

Unfortunately, neither the idea of tripartite consultations nor the proposal for a meeting of the five leading Asia-Pacific region states met with a positive reaction from either Washington or Tokyo. The newspaper MAINICHI SHIMBUN writes: "To all appearances, the initiative for a multilateral forum, which could be called the Asian version of the Helsinki process, is aimed at the Soviet Union's political and economic involvement in the Asia-Pacific region and at eliminating U.S. naval supremacy there. In order to ease tension in the Asia-Pacific region, it is necessary to reduce the naval forces which are outside the scope of the USSR-U.S. talks on disarmament. The Asian countries," the newspaper goes on, "show great interest in Gorbachev's proposals and pin great hopes on them. Canada and Australia have submitted similar initiatives on the creation of multilateral forums."

Indeed, in Singapore these states' official representatives unequivocally supported the convening of a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Asia. This statement was made at a session of the Asia-Pacific Economic Council [APEC], whose very existence proves that the quest for ways of discussing regional problems on a multilateral basis is not going on only in Moscow. Indeed, this is a commandment of the times.

APEC comprises ASEAN member countries (Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei), the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and South Korea. At the forthcoming APEC session in Seoul, this list is likely to include China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong as well. The issue of the form of the Soviet Union's participation is also under discussion. An important step in this direction has already been made. The fact is that ASEAN members have adopted the tradition of holding annual conferences of foreign ministers, and then timing meetings with other APEC members to coincide with them. This year the USSR and PRC foreign ministers will participate in this exchange of views for the first time, along with the foreign department heads of the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and South Korea. They were invited in the capacity of observers to the meeting of the "partners in dialogue," which begins 21 June in the Malaysian capital, immediately following the conference of the six ASEAN foreign ministers.

While in Singapore recently, Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu spoke of a "new hemisphere of prosperity," which in the 21st century may embrace Northeast Asia, Indochina, and ASEAN. If this forecast is true, there can be no doubt that the diversity and complexity of problems in a region where one-half the planet's population is concentrated will prompt the "hemisphere of prosperity" to join the "zone of security and cooperation," which is taking shape on the basis of the Helsinki Process in the more northern expanses—"from Vancouver to Vladivostok."

Recently, the U.N. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific proposed that advantage be taken of the end of the "cold war" to transform the Asia-Pacific region into a zone of openness, cooperation, and development. This is an authoritative recognition of the new opportunities born of the cardinal change in the world's political climate, the change from alienation and confrontation to dialogue and collaboration. The formation of peace-loving communities in Europe and Asia must in time converge to lay the foundations for a single, international, democratic space.

Bessmertnykh on Warsaw Pact, Security Issues

PM080716009l Moscow LIN PRESS RELEASE in English 3 Jul 91

[Interview with Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh by Vladimir Markov; place and date not given; first paragraph is introduction: "Soviet Foreign Minister on the Dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and Its Implications for Europe, the USSR, and the Situation in Yugoslavia"]

[Text] Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, on his return from the final session in Prague of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, at which the definitive decision on its dissolution was taken, talked to Novosti's Vladimir Markov.

The role of the Warsaw Pact

[Bessmertnykh] We believe that the Warsaw Pact played a vital role from 1955 onwards, guaranteeing the security of its member countries. Not one international conflict occurred in Europe during its existence. These are, however pages in its history, which from a contemporary

viewpoint evoke unpleasant memories. Such is the case of the events in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

The Warsaw Pact was the very institution which came forward with a number of very important programmes and disarmament proposals in Europe. If the Warsaw Pact had never existed, there would not, in my opinion, have been the INF Treaty, although this was a bilateral treaty between the USSR and the USA. The Warsaw Pact did play a part in its elaboration, however, as did NATO. It did, therefore, fulfil the aims for which it was created.

Bessmertnykh on future relations with Eastern European countries

[Bessmertnykh] The dissolution of the Warsaw Pact in no way means that there will be any rupture in relations between its former members states or that relations between them will now be fundamentaly different. I would in fact say: quite the opposite. Literally all the participants in the closed sessions in Prague emphasized, one after the other, the same idea; that a new chapter in our joint relations is about to begin.

They will be based on new legal and political footings. And they will also have major political possibilities, as well as in economic and other sectors. The Prague documents also refer to multilateral consultations, conducted on the most important issues. The common desire to form joint partner relations is expressed in these documents. From the point of view of the scale and depth of developing joint relations with former member states, prospects have not deteriorated; rather they have perhaps even improved.

Bessmertnykh on new aspects guaranteeing the USSR'S security

[Bessmertnykh] The defence costs of the Soviet Union will now be lower, given that we will only have to defend our borders and security interests, whereas it cost us a considerable amount of money to maintain the Warsaw Pact. The common European process is developing in the right direction and new institutes are being created. We are promoting their development in all kinds of ways, but will rely on ourselves, strengthening our own defence and security.

Bessmertnykh on events in Yugoslavia

[Markov] Do the developments in Yugoslavia and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact threaten to destablise the situation in Europe?

[Bessmertnykh] All necessary measures are being taken to prevent this from happening. The mechanisms of the CSCE, which defuse tense situations, including developments in Yugoslavia, are being set in motion. We proceed from the fact that Yugosalvia must remain a single unified state. The Soviet Union maintains constant contact with the Yugoslav leadership, and has expressed its readiness to promote in any way possible an appeasement and normalisation of the situation in the country.

When people talk about the possible influence of the common European mechanisms on events in Yugoslavia, we stress the need to ensure that such influence in no way goes beyond the principles laid down in the CSCE documents, and above all, of course, that it meets the demands of the Yugoslavs themselves and that the problems are resolved by democratic means.

In any case, one should be very vigilant about the developments in Europe and preserve its stability. I think that we will achieve this by acting together.

Deryabin on CSCE Discussions on Yugoslavia

OW0807035591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1030 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Unlike Yugoslavia the Soviet Union believes that the striving of some republics to secede is its internal affair. Yuriy Deryabin who leads the Soviet delegation at the Prague conference of senior CSCE officials has stressed in an interview for IF [INTERFAX] that the USSR intends to do all it can to help Yugoslavia overcome its crisis, the more so as the Yugoslavs themselves are interested in this. However if the CSCE actively joins this process, this will raise the issue of a precedent which might be used in the future toward the USSR itself.

If the CSCE decides to send in the framework of its mechanism for consultations and cooperation during conflicts a mission of observers or a good-services mission to the USSR as it did to Yugoslavia, this can happen only with the Soviet Union's consent, say the diplomat. According to him, the Soviet Union views such events as developments in the Baltic republics, exclusively as belonging to its own competence.

Read this information in more detail in our today's edition of "Diplomatic Panorama."

'World This Week' on G-7 Meeting, Cambodia

LD3006180191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network 1230 GMT 30 Jun 91

["The World This Week: International Review" moderated by Andrey Ptashnikov, with political observer Valentin Zorin and commentator Stanislav Blazhenkov]

[Excerpts] Hello, comrades. [passage omitted] You know, paradoxical though it may seem, I want to begin with an event that has not happened yet, but one for which very active preparations are at present underway. I refer to the meeting of the leaders of the seven leading capitalist states, due to be held in London in mid-July. [passage omitted] Everywhere one of the main questions has been: What program will President Gorbachev bring with him to London, and what steps should the West take to help the USSR? What can be said about this? I

asked this question of political observer Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, who is here to take part in our program.

[Zorin] You know, Andrey Vladimirovich [Ptashnikov], there is something in the way the world press is presenting the forthcoming meeting of the Seven that I cannot accept. The discussion is on the lines of how much will Gorbachev ask for? How much will Gorbachev be given? What can the Soviet Union use to guarantee the loans that he will get? At best the talk is not of credits and loans, but of investment. It seems to me that this is, well, to put it mildly, not a correct understanding of the program which the Soviet—the president of the Soviet Union—is bringing to London. The fact is that observers are writing in this vein, and not only the Western ones, by the way—some of our colleagues are also treating the subject in this key. What the representatives of our shop write, we can survive: Journalists are expected to make mistakes, in order later to be corrected.

[Ptashnikov] Well, you know, Valentin Sergeyevich, I can imagine that these are probably not mistakes, but rather conscious attempts to make out that our president will be going to London with hand outstretched.

[Zorin] There is a deliberate element. There is, certainly, an attempt to blow this up for political ends, undoubtedly,. But I want to say that what is especially distressing is that even very influential and prominent political figures in the West—economists, political scientists, sociologists—are also now, when they speak of the forthcoming meeting in London—and they are talking about it a great deal—conducting the discussion in this manner. This is alarming for the reason that it means they have not seen the main thrust in the plan which the Soviet president has now put forward in several public statements. I do not want to say we are not interested in credits and investments. This is certainly an important topic and, well, it would be a lot harder for us to extricate ourselves from the grim situation in which our economy now finds itself if we had to rely entirely on our own resources. There was such a line, of national arrogance and self-reliance. That would be more difficult. Of course credits will help, within reasonable limits, and it would be very good to attract investments. All the same, however, the program that the Soviet Union will take to London is on a much larger scale, and much broader; and it is a matter not of various problems of today, but of a strategy for several years, and perhaps many years, ahead. [passage omitted]

Yet it is not simply a matter of credits. It is a matter of allowing the Soviet Union, the Soviet economic system, to be integrated into the world economic system. [passage omitted]

[Ptashnikov] Well, to conclude our program on a more positive note, I will dwell on an event that occurred in the middle of last week, in the Thai town of Pattaya. A sitting of the supreme council [as heard] of Cambodia took place there. Very important accords have finally been reached at the council on a settlement of the Cambodian problem. And so I will ask Stanislav Blazhenkov, commentator, to talk in more detail about this.

[Blazhenkov] This meeting at the negotiating table between members of the supreme national council of Cambodia, which includes representatives of all the Khmer sides, can, it seems to me, with all justification be considered to be the beginning of the conclusive stage of a Cambodian settlement. A manifest breakthrough in the resolution of the Cambodian problem and the resolution of all those difficult problems of this long-suffering country, where war has been continuing for 12 years, is evident. [passage omitted]

[Ptashnikov] I, for my part, will talk about the attitude of our country to what has happened in the Thai town of Pattaya—that is, to the results of the meeting in this town. There was a conversation about this at a briefing which was held at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Administration, and Vitaliy Churkin, head of this administration, said among other things, that the USSR welcomes the progress in the inter-Khmer dialogue, and supports the constructive elements that have been evident in the process of national reconciliation in Cambodia. The realization of the accords reached would assist the transfer of negotiations to the conclusive stage of the international Paris conference. In this regard it would become important to ensure the continuity of the negotiations process in Cambodia with the participation of all the interested parties. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it reiterates its readiness, together with other states, to officially assume appropriate obligations.

And you know, Stanislav, my last question. One may say that the negotiations in Pattaya have ended in success. Various states in the world support the decisions adopted at this conference. Well, and what now?

[Blazhenkov] Well, as has already been noted at the briefing—you have just talked about this—it is a question now of conducting the conclusive stage of the Paris international conference, with the participation of all the Khmer factions and interested countries, where it is planned to sign a comprehensive agreement on a settlement in Cambodia.

[Ptashnikov] Well, let's hope that this will happen as soon as possible, and our planet will rid itself of one more very lengthy and bloodthirsty conflict. On this I will also conclude our broadcast. Thank you for your attention. Goodbye.

United States & Canada

Gerasimov Supports McNamara Arms Cuts Call

91WC0122A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 26, 29 Jun 91 p 12

[Observer Gennadiy Gerasimov's "The World at the End of the Week" column: "But the Atom Is Still in Uniform"]

[Text] The rhetorical flourishes "provided there is no war" are no longer audible. We have already become accustomed to this gift of perestroyka. The about-face in foreign policy has removed the subject of the military atom from the pages of the newspapers, while the peaceful atom which rebelled in Chernobyl has distorted the nuclear phobia.

Yet somewhere nuclear weapons are being cleaned and greased so that they will be ready if.... And missile crematorium delivery systems, which are efficient as it is, are even being upgraded. Although their owners are now peaceably disposed toward one another, and it is hard to imagine what could set them at odds once again.

Why, then, the duty alert at the nuclear furnaces? In life, as in the theater also, a gun hanging on a wall could go off on its own accord. The situation worries at least three people: Hans Bethe and Kurt Gottfried, American physicists, and Robert McNamara, former president of the World Bank and former U.S. defense secretary under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. It may be recalled for the sake of truth that equal alarm was also expressed several years ago by a group of Soviet scientists who took part in compiling the report "Strategic Stability Under the Conditions of a Radical Reduction in Nuclear Arms." The authors showed here that a few percent of the American and Soviet nuclear arsenals are sufficient to ensure strategic stability and peace. It is possible that the report appeared prematurely and that public opinion and diplomacy were not ready at that time for a "radical reduction." The report passed unnoticed.

Now the above-mentioned American trio have published, on 27 June in the journal NEW YORK REVIEW OF BUSINESS, something akin to a manifesto under the heading "Nuclear Weapons: A Proposal." This proposal essentially concurs with the above-mentioned report: The defensive sufficiency ceiling is somewhere around the level of five percent of the present nuclear arsenals of the United States and the USSR. Or, put another way, the sides' "overkill" surplus is 20-fold. Or, in figures, 1,000 nuclear warheads a side is sufficient, counting both strategic and tactical delivery systems. These reduced arsenals, preserved as yet for the sake of deterrence, should be invulnerable to a first strike. Otherwise there would be no convincing threat of a retaliatory strike. It is, accordingly, time to apply the brakes to military-engineering thought, which is hurtling toward the abyss, to preserve the ABM Treaty, to halt nuclear testing, to not manufacture weapons designed to "decapitate" the leadership of the other side, and so forth.

These changes in military planning are dictated by common sense. For example, the strategy of "flexible response" providing for the possibility of launching nuclear weapons was intended at some stage of a military complex [as published] to prevent an invasion of West Europe by the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact. The authors of the report comment: "The legitimacy of this aspect of nuclear strategy had always been open to question. But now it has vanished completely on account of the collapse of Soviet power in Central and East Europe.

Within the framework of the Soviet-American confrontation, which has been turned by perestroyka simply into a comparison, "the present size and composition of the sides' strategic forces are not only extravagant anachronisms but are becoming also a slumbering threat, which can no longer be justified.... The present strategic forces do not serve the interests either of the United States or the Soviet Union."

McNamara and the others insistently counsel that the United States take the initiative here. They are worried not by the power of our missile forces but their security. They also have in mind the textbook gun on the wall when they warn: "Chernobyl and a number of tragedies with Soviet submarines, ships, and oil pipelines point to the particular susceptibility of Soviet organizations to so-called normal accidents, and we are hardly immune to them either."

Of course, there are many aspects to this problem. The smooth involvement of the other nuclear powers, which may be expected only following the requisite steps of the two leading powers, is essential. After all, even after the conclusion of a START treaty, the authors remind us, the United States will be left with approximately 9,000 strategic warheads, the Soviet Union with approximately 8,000, and tactical nuclear weapons will remain also, whereas China, Britain, and France together have little more than 1,500 warheads. And all nuclear powers must reinforce nuclear nonproliferation procedures, which is best done by the imposition of a ban on nuclear testing and the introduction of international inspection of nuclear weapon deployment sites.

Northeast Asia

Solomon's Views on DPRK Nuclear Issue Discussed

SK0907063791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 0900 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] In an interview with South Korea's Korean Broadcasting System [KBS] TV, Richard Solomon, U.S. assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, stated that U.S. troops stationed in South Korea can be reduced if talks between the South and North result in reducing tensions on the Korean Peninsula. Concerning this, station commentator [name indistinct] writes the following:

Everything considered, the statement by the U.S. assistant secretary of state seems to indicate that Washington wants to stabilize the situation on the Korean Peninsula.

In fact, leaving the Korean Peninsula to remain as a source of tension in the world will benefit no one.

Meantime, in his interview, Richard Solomon stated that the U.S. position on the DPRK has not changed. His statement as such can be interpreted as: the United States will not participate in any military and political negotiations proposed by the DPRK, nor take any measures designed to normalize relations with the DPRK unless Pyongyang agrees on international inspection of its nuclear facilities and makes headway in talks with South Korea after [word indistinct]. The United States believes that talks on military and political issues should be conducted within the framework of the South-North talks.

As is widely known, the South-North talks had been broken off by Pyongyang on account of the Team Spirit military exercise conducted annually by the United States and South Korea. This turn of events was due to the impact that the United States has on the Korean Peninsula's situation. As is known, more than 40,000 U.S. servicemen are stationed in South Korea.

This is precisely the reason why the DPRK insists on holding talks with the United States to discuss many issues, including such important issues as (?nuclear safeguards).

Pyongyang has recently agreed on resuming talks with the International Atomic Energy Agency on the international inspection of its own nuclear facilities. At the same time, Pyongyang is demanding that Washington withdraw its nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Nevertheless, the United States sees no relation at all between the DPRK's fulfillment of its international duty defined by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which it has signed and U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea.

Washington has no intention of discussing with Pyongyang either this nuclear weapons issue or any other military or political issue.

Considering [words indistinct], the United States waits for Pyongyang to take a step forward toward the settlement of such issues.

Richard Solomon's interview with a reporter of the South Korean KBS TV seems to have meant that if Pyongyang takes a positive step in this direction, the United States will take responsive measures.

DPRK Official Violates Customs Regulations

PM0907085891 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Jul 91 p 1

[Unattributed report from news agencies roundup: "Border Incident"]

[Text] At Khasan station on the border between the USSR and the DPRK there has been an incident involving Yi Chol-sin, deputy head of the North Korean Foreign Ministry Committee for Cultural Relations. He refused to allow 39 pieces of baggage to be inspected by customs. The baggage was registered as exhibition equipment. Furthermore Yi Chol-sin locked himself in his compartment.

The customs officers were also prevented from carrying out their duties by 16 North Koreans traveling with Yi Chol-sin who refused to leave for the DPRK after the customs inspection was over. The railcar containing the North Korean citizens was uncoupled from the rest of the train. But its occupants dispatched two people to Khasan settlement. Shortly afterwards, over 60 Korean workers had gathered in the vicinity of the station. They started a fight in which a Soviet customs officer and a militiaman were beaten up. The local authorities took measures to restore order. Yi Chol-sin's baggage was searched anyway. A sum of 9,000 rubles [R], 3,105 U.S. dollars, and goods worth R30,000 that had not been listed on the customs declaration were confiscated.

DPRK's Welcome of ROK Investment Examined

SK0907070791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 0900 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] Quoting the words of the spokesman for the ROK Ministry of Trade and Industry, South Korea's News Agency YONHAP reported that the DPRK will not raise any objection to investment from South Korea so long as it comes through third-party countries.

Station commentator [name indistinct] writes:

It is difficult to ascertain whether the YONHAP report is true or not, as it has not been officially confirmed, but the news report can be trusted because it fits the present political situation on the Korean Peninsula.

This has something to do with the DPRK's recent decision to apply for UN membership before the end of this year. As is widely known, Pyongyang, while maintaining an uncompromising and unrealistic position up until recently, has insisted on a simultaneous admission of the South and North into the United Nations.

The clear fact in which two independent states with different positions on international issues exist on the Korean Peninsula has been ignored. Quite recently, however, Pyongyang has shifted its attitude and agreed on separately applying for a UN seat along with South Korea as proposed by Seoul.

There is no need to repeat the fact that Pyongyang's decision has received a fervid reaction in South Korea and the world at large.

Some observers, including those from the countries in Asia and the Pacific, interpreted this to mean that Pyongyang has given up its policy of refusing to recognize South Korea as a completely independent state.

Yet, it may be too early to talk about normalized relations between the South and North. The South and North have many obstacles to overcome before the normalization of their relations. It is not easy to rid oneself of an old, stereotyped way of thinking. It may be for this reason that Pyongyang seems to insist on receiving ROK investment in the DPRK economics only through third-party countries. At the same time, this may unquestionably turn out to be a step forward. This is because up until recently, the DPRK leadership has adamantly refused to even think about any kind of economic cooperation with South Korea.

Nobody doubts that South Korea's investment in the DPRK will greatly benefit the latter. No less important is that cooperation of this kind between the two Koreas will contribute to consolidating stability on the Korean Peninsula and to rendering the overall situation in Asia healthy.

Commentator Views DPRK-ROK Summit Talks

SK0907033691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1100 GMT 7 Jul 91

[(Kriv Mikhalov) commentary from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] As is already known, ROK President No Tae-u, who ended his U.S. visit, said that he intends to meet DPRK President Kim Il-song to discuss the issues of normalizing the situation on the Korean Peninsula and of resolving the question of Korean reunification.

Station commentator (Kriv Mikhalov) writes about the issues as follows:

Until now, Pyongyang did not respond to the proposal made by the ROK president for the summit talks. In addition, it is difficult for us to say whether its answer would be affirmative or not.

As is known, the DPRK said that the North-South premier-level talks should be successfully held in order to hold such summit talks. It is true, however, that such premier-level talks would not help them understand their positions. Last February, the premier-level talks were suspended because of the Team Spirit military exercise conducted by the ROK-U.S. armed forces.

The North and South stress the need for national reunification. Both sides, however, could not reach an agreement whenever they discussed the specific policies, forms, and procedures for national reunification. This is not because both sides had no intention of implementing national reunification, but because they continue to distrust each other. This is why they cannot reach an agreement.

The present generation remembers the tragedy of the bloody fratricidal war in the 1950s. In addition, it is still too early for us to say that the cold war is over. It will require much effort and time to end the cold war and to build confidence between both sides.

When and how can Korean reunification be realized ? This is the task that the Korean people should resolve themselves. However, both sides of Korea do not pay attention to the settlement of the task. Today the confrontation on the Korean Peninsula will not benefit anyone else.

The appeal made by President No Tae-u for the Korean summit talks in the course of his visit to Washington is very symbolic. Recently, the United States also has been greatly interested in resolving the question of Korean reunification. Washington and Seoul continue to maintain the presence of U.S. troops in the ROK in the pretext of a so-called threat of southward invasion.

If the tension is reduced on the Korean Peninsula, the United States will reduce the financial burden caused by the presence of its 43,000 troops in the ROK. According to a statement issued by the United States some time ago, the United States is expected to reduce its troops stationed in the ROK by 7,000 soldiers by 1995.

The issue of withdrawing U.S. troops from the ROK will be discussed when the dialogue and friendly exchanges between the North and South have been positively promoted.

Very favorable conditions for the summit talks proposed by President No Tae-u have been created. Among them is the simultaneous admission to the United Nations by the DPRK and ROK. The ROK expects that the premier-level meeting will occur when the simultaneous UN admission by both sides has been realized. The summit talks also will be held when the issues on the premier talks and UN admission have been resolved.

Vladivostok Symposium on Ties With Japan Closes

OW0907051791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1030 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] An international symposium on problems relating to the Asia-Pacific region and on the ways to promote relations between the USSR and Japan was concluded in Vladivostok on Friday. It was sponsored by the World Economy and International Relations Institute (WEIRI) under the Soviet Academy of Sciences and by Japan's Center for Developing Composite Research (MIRA).

In comments on the outcome of the symposium Vladimir Ivanov, Chief of WEIRI's department on the

Asia-Pacific region, told IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent that those present had reached a high degree of consensus. Participants in the symposium agreed that the efforts to stabilize life in the Soviet Union should lean both on internal reserves and on foreign aid, including material and intellectual, said V. Ivanov.

For Japan this is a complicated problem, he said, since official Tokyo clings to its belief that solution to the territorial problem should be a condition for serious talks on granting aid to the USSR.

I take the liberty of saying that this issue was not raised at the symposium, declared Vladimir Ivanov.

Near East & South Asia

PLO 'Ready To Accept' 'Curtailed' Conference

OW0907043291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 8 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama": "CPSU-PLO Dialogue was Useful"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A Soviet communist party delegation led by the deputy in charge of the Central Committee's international department, Mr Yuriy Zuyev, is now back in Moscow after holding talks in Tunis with PLO leaders.

Mr. Zuyev said the visit was the first of its kind on PLO's formal invitation although party-to-party contacts had existed for quite some time. He told an IF [INTERFAX] correspondent that in the past, Palestinians used to come to Moscow themselves to be involved in various party or government forums.

Mr. Zuyev spoke of lengthy talks between his delegation and PLO leaders including meetings with the director of PLO's political department. Mr Al-Qaddumi, member of the PLO's executive, Mr. Abu Mazin, [Mahmud 'Abbasa] and the organisation's leader, Mr. Yasir 'Arafat.

In his words, the Middle East featured centrally on the agenda. "We felt that Palestinians were longing to start a negotiating process," he said. Palestinians are in active support of a Middle East peace conference, said Mr. Zuyev, and PLO is ready to accept even a "curtailed" version of the conference provided Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 are observed.

Mr. Zuyev said that although a UN-sponsored Middle East conference was due to be held last year with participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council and all sides concerned, including PLO, the situation had changed after the Gulf war. The question now is one of a conference which will be chaired by the Soviet Union and the United States, something that PLO is unopposed to, said Mr. Zuyev.

However, he indicated that it was desirable that the United Nations should be involved in searches of ways for a Middle East settlement. Mr. Zuyev said that Israel must also be keen to see that happen if it really wants relevant resolutions to carry guarantees. For similar considerations, he said, Israel must be keen to see PLO's participation in the conference. Mr. Zuyev said PLO was the only representative of the Palestinians and that there was no going away from the fact.

In his words, PLO was appreciative of Soviet foreign policy as a whole and in the Middle East in particular. Mr. Zuyev said PlO showed understanding of the Soviet Union's contacts with israel which was meeting the interests of all regional countries and nations. The only issue causing PLO's justifiable concern is the settlement of Soviet emigres in the Israeli-occupied Arab lands. He also indicated that in a sense, Moscow was acting as a mediator between PLO and the United States. Mr. Zuyev said the Palestinians were highly appreciative of that hoping that the process of a Middle East settlement would at last be given a push.

Indian Premier Thanks Gorbachev for Message

PM0907103991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

[Message from Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev; date not given]

[Text] To His Excellency USSR President M.S. Gorbachev

Your Excellency,

I am grateful for your kind congratulations on my appointment as Indian prime minister and for your kind wishes in connection with my 70th birthday. We have valued highly the close, friendly, mutually beneficial relations between India and the Soviet Union over the decades. The Soviet-Indian Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation, the 20th anniversary of which we celebrate this year, laid foundations for the development of relations that have stood the test of time. Our government devotes paramount attention to maintaining the dynamism of and giving a fresh boost to bilateral cooperation, and strengthening and broadening political cooperation on the main international problems.

I would like to take this opportunity to convey to you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Indian people and myself personally best wishes for your good health and success in performing your responsible duties and tasks.

P.V. Narasimha Rao.

Iranian Air Force Commander Arrives for Talks

LD0707163391 Teheran IRIB Television Second Program Network in English 1445 GMT 7 Jul 91

[Text] The commander of the Iranian Air force, General Sattari, has arrived in the USSR at the head of a high-ranking military delegation. Gen. Sattari, who arrived this morning, will hold dialogues with the Soviet

officials to promote bilateral cooperation in aerospace research. The Air Force commander is in Moscow at the invitation of his Soviet counterpart, Gen. (?Shaposhnikov).

East Europe

USSR, Bulgaria To Formulate Treaty on Ties

LD0507145291 Moscow TASS in English 1433 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—Taking into account thorough-going democratic restructuring in the Soviet Union and Bulgaria and considerable changes in the European and international situation, the sides consider it necessary to renovate the treaty basis for their relations and agreed to elaborate and sign a new wide-ranging political treaty, reads a joint statement by the Soviet and Bulgarian foreign ministries, distributed here today.

After the new treaty comes into effect, the treaty on friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance, dated May 12, 1967, will become invalid, the statement reads.

Foreign Ministry Officials on Kvitsinskiy Trip

OW0907034791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By Mikhail Mayorov and Igor Porshnev, diplomatic correspondents, from the "Diplomatic Panorama"; "Yuliy Kvitsinskiy in Yugoslavia: 'Heeding is Needed Rather Than Imposing Views'"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Gorbachev's special envoy, Mr Yutiy Kvitsinskiy, now in Yugoslavia, has been instructed to act as circumstances arise but is line with the Soviet Union's position on the crisis in that country. The President's press-secretariat said Mr Kvitsinskiy's mission was intended to help towards a reasonable solution to the crisis in a measure deemed necessary by the Yugoslav side. The secretariat said it would be hard to describe the mission by the deputy foreign minister who is in charge of European affairs as mediatory. It said the question was one of wording.

President Gorbachev's press officials said Mr Kvitsinskiy's mission was caused by a request from Yugoslavia which believes his participation in the talks was desirable. Soviet foreign ministry's officials told an IF [INTERFAX] correspondent that Mr Kvitsinskiy was planning to meet both the federal and republican authorities in Yugoslavia. They said he was inclined to listen to rather than impose any remedies since the Soviet Union's position was that of non involvement. It believes it is up to Yugoslavs to sort out their internal affairs. Soviet diplomats said Mr Kvitsinskiy's visit was not anything out of the ordinary but must be seen within the context of similar missions by European Community countries.

Deraybin Statement on Yugoslavia, CSCE

OW0907041791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 8 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Ministry expects that the papers adopted in Prague by the senior officials committee of CSCE countries can help reach a settlement in Yugoslavia. The question is one of urgent appeals to the Yugoslav authorites about a ceasefire and CSCE recommendations for a team of ceasefire monitors and a good offices mission to be sent to that country. The first one is expected to monitor compliance with the truce agreement, and the second one—to help open dialogue between the conflicting sides. The ceasefire monitoring team is to be formed on the basis of agreements between Yugoslavia and European Community, although other CSCE countries may join it. The team is expected to inform the senior officials committee about its work.

The head of the Soviet delegation at the conference in Prague, Mr Yuriy Deryabin, in an exclusive interview to IF [INTERFAX] said this was the first time that the newly-set up mechanism of consultations and cooperation in conflict situation was being put at work, and that the meeting in Prague showed the Helsinki process was acquiring a new quality. In his words, the Soviet position lies in trying in every way to help Yugoslavs extricate themselves out of the crisis given that they are keen to do so themselves. However, the question arises of a precedent when the CSCE is being explicitly engaged in respect of internal affairs by a member-country.

Mr Deryabin said the Soviet delegation had repeatedly stressed in Prague that both missions must be sent to Yugoslvia only on its own request and must operate in close touch with its authorites. However, the Soviet diplomat said no precedent must be created in respect of other countries in future. Should a similar situation arise in the Soviet Union, said Mr Deryabin, its invitation and agreement must be a decisive factor. He emphasised that unlike Yugoslavia, his country held a differing view about its own internal situation including that in the Baltic republics which it believes to be its own internal affair.

Correspondent on Yugoslav, EC Relations

OW0807052291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 5 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A correspondent for Yugoslav-based POLITIKA in Moscow, Risto Bayalskiy, says the CSCE countries are entitled to consider the situation in Yugoslavia since the issue is linked to European security but they cannot

interfere in its internal affairs by taking tough action. This, he said, will be out of line with the Helsinki process.

He told our diplomatic correspondent that the EC could just offer its good offices of help Yugoslavia sort out its internal conflict which can affect the overall situation in the continent. In his view, Yugoslavia can agree to the sending of a special CSCE mission to give recommendations rather than impose its views. Mr Bayalskiy described as "coherent and correct" the position taken by the Soviet Union which calls for the Yugoslav conflict to be resolved by Yugoslavs themselves.

Soviet, Polish Experts Elaborate Draft Treaty

LD0607111591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2001 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Warsaw, 5 Jul (TASS)—A plenary meeting of the delegation of Soviet and Polish experts elaborating the draft of a new interstate treaty on good-neighborliness and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Poland took place in Warsaw today.

The delegations, led by Yu.B.Kashlev, the USSR's ambassador to the Republic of Poland, and J.Sulek, director of the Europe department of the Republic of Poland Foreign Ministry, completed detailed consideration at their level of all the articles in the draft, the majority of which are now considered agreed upon. A number of articles contain wordings which have not been completely agreed upon.

Both sides described the work done as very successful; they proceed from the understanding that subsequent work on the text of the draft treaty will be continued at the level of the leadership of the Soviet and Polish foreign ministries.

The meeting took place in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

Lukyanov Receives Islami-Led Albanian Delegation

LD0607112691 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—Chairman of the Soviet parliament Anatoliy Lukyanov received today an Albanian parliamentary delegation, led by Chairman of the Board of the Popular Assembly of the Republic of Albania Kastriot Islami, which is staying here on an official visit.

It was stressed during a friendly conversation that the resumption and development of Soviet-Albanian relations in various spheres in accordance with the principles of equality, respect for each other's sovereignty, independence and non-interference in internal affairs meet the interests of both nations and fall in line with the goals of cooperation on the European continent. Parliaments are to play an important role in it.

The sides informed each other of the main directions of the tranformations taking place in the Soviet Union and Albania, and of the work of supreme legislative authorities. They went on record in favour of maintaining regular contacts between them.

During the discussion of international problems the sides mentioned prospects of the cooperation between the two countries and their parliaments as participants in the all-European process.

Nishanov, Katushev Meet Group

LD0607113491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1819 GMT 5 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Rostislav Gertsev]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jul (TASS)—Prospects for the development of interparliamentary ties and issues relating to cooperation between the two countries' highest legislative bodies on a regular basis and to interaction in international parliamentary organizations were discussed at a meeting held today between Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and members of a delegation from Albania's People's Assembly, which is in Moscow on an official visit.

On the same day, the Albanian parliamentarians visited the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, where they were received by the minister, Konstantin Katushev. The economic position in Albania and the USSR, and the prospects for broadening trade and economic cooperation between the two countries, formed the subject of the conversation.

It is known that Soviet specialists once provided Albania with substantial help in creating a whole series of industries—power engineering, metal processing, textile, woodworking, and several others. It is now a question of restoring the mutually beneficial ties that were sundered 30 years ago. The beginning of this year saw the signing, after such a lengthy gap, of the first long-term agreement on trade, economic, and technical cooperation between the USSR and Albania, and a protocol on trade and economic cooperation for 1991. Preparations are already under way for the opening of a Soviet trade mission in Tirana.

It is not excluded that Kastriot Islami, the head of the Albanian parliament, will be received tomorrow by USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev.

In accordance with their program, on Saturday the Albanian parliamentarians will also tour the environs of Moscow. They will visit one of the local soviets, a collective farm, and a livestock unit.

Yanayev, Islami Discuss Ties

LD0607113991 Moscow TASS in English 1022 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—Soviet Vice-President Gennady Yanayev met a delegation from the Albanian national parliament led by National Assembly Chairman Kastriot Islami.

The sides discussed the development of Soviet-Albanian relations, as well as a number of international problems of mutual interest in a warm and friendly conversation.

Gorbachev, Islami Meet

LD0607140291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1303 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jul (TASS)—USSR president Mikhail Gorbachev met today with Kastrict Islami, president of the Albanian People's Assembly and head of the parliamentary delegation which is now in the USSR at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Kastrict Islami has handed over a reply from Ramiz Alia, the president of the Republic of Albania. This exchange of messages has strengthened the trend in Soviet-Albanian relations toward the revival of friendly and amicable relations and mutually beneficial cooperation, on a new basis and under the new conditions existing in the world and in Europe. This trend will receive international legislative reinforcement in the political treaty between the USSR and Albania and in the trade and economic agreement which is to be signed during the Albanian president's forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union.

Mikhail Gorbachev had a frank and amicable discussion with Kastrict Islami; and there was a brief exchange of views on the process of reforming society in both countries, on the difficulties of the transition period, and on the harsh problems of reshaping public consciousness—moreover, they discovered much in common.

Albanian Official on Visit

LD0807035191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1730 GMT 7 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Rostislav Gertsev]

[Text] Moscow, 7 July (TASS)—"The results of the visit have exceeded all our expectations," Kastriot Islami, president of the presidency of the Albanian People's Assembly and head of a parliamentary delegation from his country, said today in an interview with your TASS correspondent at the end of the official part of his visit to the USSR. "We have had the opportunity to meet not only Anatoliy Lukyanov, leader of the Soviet parliament, but also USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev," he emphasized. "I would particularly like to note that we met with complete mutual understanding and have perceived a readiness for the development of Soviet-Albanian relations on the part of the leadership of your country".

Kastriot Islami said that work has begun on a Soviet-Albanian [words indistinct] which will define the future political [words indistinct] of Albania, Ramiz Alia. The date of the visit has not yet been decided.

The leader of the Albanian delegation invited Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to visit Albania at a time convenient to him in order to sign an inter-parliamentary agreement. The possibilities for an exchange of visits by the ministers of foreign affairs of the two countries were also discussed.

"That is just the beginning," Kastriot Islami considers. "On our next visit we hope to arrive at more specific matters and at meetings between our people at all levels and in all spheres. Everything that we are talking about here must not remain on paper only."

The Albanian parliamentary delegation departs from the Soviet Union tomorrow.

Islami Interviewed

LD0807222491 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Rostislav Gertsev]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—"In its democratic development Albania has already gone beyond the point of no return", President of the Presidium of the People's Assembly of Albania, Kastriot Islami, said in an interview with TASS in Moscow on Sunday upon the conclusion of the Albanian parliamentary delegation's visit in the USSR.

"It is now difficult to establish which circles of the Albanian population support any given party", he said, describing the political situation in the country. "The Albanian society is divided into socialist and antisocialist forces, rather than on party principle. Economic problems came to the fore, and many alter their positions depending on parties' outside support, and, consequently, chances for larger material assistance".

Islami believes that the emergence of a new wave of politicians- intellectuals is characteristic of Albania, just as of the majority of East European countries. This is a positive phenomenon: it makes political processes more dynamic and brings new views and new mentality into them. At the same time, they do not have appropriate training and experience of managerial activity.

Islami believes that after a definite period of time, the present politicians will be replaced by professionals—lawyers and economists—in a natural way.

"Being a European country, Albania is naturally striving for European integration, for participation in European processes", Islami said. "We want tranquility in Europe. We wish democratic processes in the region to develop

naturally. Albania is against the destruction of the existing European frontiers. Therefore we are particularly concerned with the situation in the Balkans".

As to the problem of Kosovo Albanians, Albania's attitude has always been definite, the head of the Albanian Parliament said. All the problems should be decided at a negotiation table, and every man, all groups and all peoples should protect their rights in the framework of law.

Treaty To Be Drafted

OW0907083091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 8 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] It was pointed out at a recent meeting between President Gorbachev and the Chairman of Albania's People's Assembly, parliament, Mr Kastriot Islyami, that a change for a better in bilateral relations will be laid down in a political treaty and trade agreement expected to be signed during the forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union by the Albanian President Ramiz Alia. [sentence as received]

A Soviet diplomat of the foreign ministry's third European departemnt described a relevant draft treaty as virgin soil which needed time to upturn. He told an IF [INTERFAX] correspondent the two countries did not have a similar treaty before severing relations in the early 1960s.

The diplomat said the treaty would be based on the same principles which were being laid down into draft agreements with other countries, including those of Eastern Europe. He said that both the Soviet Unin and Albania were taking steps not to delay things, but he declined to say whether all the details would be agreed upon by the end of this year.

Accordingly, no date has yet been fixed for Mr Alia's visit to the Soviet Union. The Soviet diplomat said the leaders of the two countries had agreed to hold a summit meeting, but the question of timing was still open.

Albania's Alia Comments on Kosovo Situation

PM0907104591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Neighbors on Crisis in Yugoslavia"]

[Text] At a meeting with representatives of the supreme military command Albanian President Ramiz Alia assessed the events in neighboring Yugoslavia as a threat to peace in the Balkans and in Europe.

During the talk, the ATA agency reports, R. Alia voiced special concern at the situation in the autonomous province of Kosovo, which is part of the Yugoslav republic of Serbia. The president said that in Kosovo, the absolute majority of whose population consists of citizens of Albanian nationality, a rise in Serbian chauvinism has again been noted and the mass arming of Serbs and Montenegrins living there is under way. The threat of bloody reprisal looms over the Albanians.

Considering the situation which has taken shape, the Albanian leader demanded that the army command maintain a high degree of combat readiness among the troops and be able at any moment to defend Albania's freedom, independence, and sovereignty.

Soviet Expert Comments on Economic Talks

AU0307072291 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 27 Jun 91 pp 1,5

[Interview with Admiral Yuriy Grishin, Soviet deputy foreign trade minister, by Peter Vajda; on 27 June; place not given: "Five Billion for a Flower?—Grishin Is Also Disappointed"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Text] Recently, we have been publishing the news on the financial negotiations relating to the Soviet troop withdrawals and we have published statements by the leader and the spokesman of the Hungarian delegation. The day after the failure to sign the protocol, we asked Yuriy Grishin, who participated in the negotiations, to answer our questions. We publish excerpts from our interview with him.

[Vajda] Are you disappointed that the signing of the protocol did not happen? What do you think the reasons were?

[Grishin] Yes, naturally, we expected the government representatives to be able to sign the document. This document would have covered the significant results we had managed to obtain. We could have attempted to summarize everything we had achieved, and this could have served as a basis to establish the official demands of the two sides. Unfortunately, we did not manage to achieve consensus on every issue and to prepare the document for signing, although we came very close to this. As a person who did not lead the delegation but who served as an expert, I think the main reason was that the two sides interpreted the goal of the negotiations differently. The Soviet side wanted to present an objective "picture" of the achievements to provide a basis for the preparations of the final balance of the two sides' demands. It became clear after a lengthy period of work that it is impossible to achieve results in one step, but we have to progress step by step.

Our position was based on the recognition that we could not do everything in one step. In the final stage of the negotiations, the Hungarian side presented demands that were unacceptable for us. In our view, these issues could have been solved differently, including the use of diplomatic channels. The results we have achieved so far in the course of negotiations make it possible to conclude

this important work in the not too distant future. It is only possible to do this if the two sides show enough flexibility and they endeavor to understand each other. We can solve this problem, but cannot do it mechanically. We have suggested several alternatives but, unfortunately, our Hungarian partners did not understand us well and we could not have a constructive dialogue.... I think it would be useful for the Hungarian foreign trade organs and authorities to play a more active role in our future work. The two partners have a different understanding of the approved method at the moment. A mechanical approach does not lead to results.

[Vajda] What does this mean?

[Grishin] We cannot agree with the opinion of our Hungarian colleagues, namely that the results of the economic assessments of the transferred facilities and the ecological demands should mechanically be lifted from the minutes of the government representatives' negotiations into the interstate document that deals with the questions of ownership and finances. The final work has to be done by the foreign trade authorities.

[Vajda] I have two additional questions. You talked about unacceptable Hungarian demands. What are they? Why are you unwilling to acknowledge the Hungarian demands regarding the damage to the natural environment; why do you not deal with these demands on merit?

[Grishin] These are two important questions. In my opinion, the Hungarian experts do not share the opinion of the Soviet experts, because the Hungarians think that the results they came to, using the agreed method, should form the basis of the state demands. I think that in this respect, our Hungarian colleagues will have to review their attitude to the aforementioned method and they will have to accept the fact that these results are not equivalent to financial demands—and this is actually part of this method. Unfortunately, the Hungarian authorities on international economic relations have not expressed their opinion regarding this point. I believe that we will be able to find a common denominator during the negotiations between the ministries responsible for international economic relations.

As for ecology, the most important thing is not to dramatize the situation that developed during our negotiations. My Hungarian colleagues might condemn me for this statement, however, we did not expect them to present a sum to us, because that contradicts the approved method. We have to receive—and now we have received—the necessary material which the Hungarian and Soviet experts will study in the spirit of the aforementioned method. The representatives can only approve this after such a study. I must say that the appropriate Hungarian organs obviously did not study the ecological material presented by the Hungarian side thoroughly enough. We would have expected a more objective presentation than the one we received. For example, there is a facility in the Hungarian side's list which used to be a firing range jointly used by the Soviets and the Hungarians. You do not need to be a soldier to understand that a firing range is a specially chosen place for a specific task and it is not a place for excursions. The Hungarian side submitted a five billion forint bill to the Soviet side because a Hungarian plant has been damaged.

[Vajda] Where is this facility?

[Grishin] This is a firing range.

[Vajda] Where?

[Grishin] We will give you the place. My colleagues know it. (The advisers told us that the "facility" in question is in the "Hortobagy" [Eastern Hungary].) This sort of attitude to the matter does not contribute to a favorable atmosphere in the working group that deals with environmental issues. The team of Soviet experts is led by Professor Goldberg, who is a highly qualified expert with extensive international practice. He can contribute to solving the problems together with the Hungarian colleagues.

[Vajda] When did Mr. Goldberg arrive?

[Grishin] Last Sunday [23 June].... The work has been interrupted for reasons unclear to us. I wonder if the Hungarian side will contribute to solving this complex problem by this step. I do not think so....

IZVESTIYA Notes Hungarian Statement

PM0807140991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Item in roundup of IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, REUTERS, and AFP reports: "Hungarian Government Statement"]

[Text] In connection with the completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal from the territory of Hungary the Hungarian Government has issued a statement which says that on 30 June Hungary celebrates its newfound sovereignty. We wholeheartedly wish for the Soviet soldiers who have left Hungary that this day will promote their further advance along the path of national renewal.

West Europe

Spain's Gonzalez Visits Moscow

Preview of Visit

LD0707083791 Moscow TASS in English 0921 GMT 6 Jul 91

[By correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez begins an official two-day visit to the Soviet Union on Monday. His visit will be capped by the signing of a treaty on friendship and cooperation

between the Soviet Union and Spain. The document will be signed by the Spanish prime minister and President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The document aims to impart a new impulse to Soviet-Spanish relations and is part of the new European security system. It envisages close interaction in disarmament and holding political consultations in case of crises in Europe or other regions.

Gonzalez's visit to the Soviet Union reflects an upsurge in relations between the two countries, following Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Spain last October.

The signing of a series of Soviet-Spanish documents in Madrid last year helped expand bilateral contacts in the parliamentary, scientific, youth and military spheres.

The signing of an inter-governmental memorandum on improving conditions in financing trade and economic cooperation during the Soviet president's visit set the stage for improvements in economic relations.

Under the document, the Spanish government offered 1.5 billion dollars worth of credits to the Soviet side to buy consumer goods, food, equipment and modern technologies.

However, trade between the Soviet Union and Spain is unstable and depends largely on the market situation. In 1990 the trade turnover was 856 million roubles, with Soviet Union enjoying a considerable trade surplus. Oil and oil products account for about 80 per cent of Soviet exports to Spain.

New forms of economic relations are emerging in relations between the Soviet Union and Spain. There are currently 10 joint societies servicing Soviet fishing and trade vessels and, trading in timber and chemical products in Spain. There are now 38 joint Soviet- Spanish ventures in the Soviet Union, specialising in consumer goods production, publishing and other areas.

Gorbachev Welcomes Gonzalez

LD0807084791 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By correspondents Aleksandr Krolikov and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife Raisa welcomed Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez and his wife at an official ceremony in the Kremlin early today.

Gonzalez arrived on an official visit in Moscow on Sunday.

Gonzalez and Gorbachev then met to discuss international issues, the European process and bilateral relations.

They were expected to discuss Soviet reforms.

Gonzalez placed a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier near the Kremlin wall.

Later today, he is expected to meet his Soviet counterpart Valentin Pavlov.

Bessmertnykh Meets Fernandez-Ordonez

LD0807085291 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and his Spanish counterpart Francisco Fernandez-Ordonez met at a Soviet foreign ministry mansion on Aleksey Tolstoy street in Moscow today.

The meeting was held in the framework of Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez's visit to the Soviet Union.

The two ministers were expected to discuss Soviet-Spanish cooperation and key international issues. They were also expected to sign several bilateral documents.

Bessmertnykh Talks to Reporters

LD0807152191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1337 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 8 Jul (TASS)—"Our main concern is that Yugoslavia resolves the questions in a way that the Yugoslav people need them to be resolved. We would prefer Yugoslavia to remain a territorially integral and united country," USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stated today in reply to questions by TASS correspondents and by Spanish journalists after the completion of his talks in Moscow with Spanish Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez Ordonez.

"Spain also proceeds from this in principle, that is to say, from those positions which were approved at the sitting of the CSCE Council of Foreign Ministers in Berlin," Aleksandr Bessmertnykh continued. "That is our common, pan-European position, and we think that this position should be adhered to. Of course, the peoples should not thereby be deprived of the right to choose, and the choice does not exist, of course. But obviously, it is in the interests of the Yugoslav people themselves to resolve this question democratically so that Yugoslavia retains its role in the world and in Europe."

Speaking about the tone in which his talks went on this topic with the Spanish Foreign Minister, Akeskandr Bessmertnykh said: "In discussing the Yugoslav situation we assessed the events occurring there and the efforts being taken directly by our countries and by the CSCE system. In particular, I made remarks to the effect that it is very important, taking account above all of the interests of Yugoslavia and its people, also to think about the new pan-European institutions creating a positive

precedent for the future. Very laborious, precise, and delicate work by these institutions is very important. It is important here that they do not err, because the tests they are now undergoing will, to a significant extent, determine their effectiveness for the future."

"We agreed," the Soviet minister added, "to maintain further contacts on the Yugoslav issue."

Concerning the efforts of the Soviet Union in connection with the situation in Yugoslavia, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh reported: "We are working actively together with all the European states. I personally have recently sent letters to the foreign ministers of the United States, France, Britain, Germany, Spain, Italy, plus the countries adjacent to Yugoslavia, in which I formulated my stand concerning the prospects for development of this situation. We are keeping in close touch with the Yugoslav leadership and with the leaderships of the republics. At the moment, our special representative—Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, USSR first deputy foreign minister—is in Yugoslavia. He has already talked with the Yugoslav leadership; and now, if I am not mistaken, he is in Slovenia. He has already visited Croatia, as well. Tomorrow, Yuliy Kvitsinskiy is coming back and he will report his assessments and the prospects for development of the situation. So, we are very active in this whole process, and we think the correct solution of the Yugoslav issue will largely pre-determine further development of European and of pan-European processes.

Bessmertnykh on Soviet-Spanish Talks

LD0807134191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1229 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 8 Jul (TASS)—A broad discussion, mainly of bilateral relations, but also of certain topical international issues, revealed a coincidence in approaches by the USSR and Spain on many problems. This was established today by the Soviet minister of foreign affairs, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, in reply to a TASS correspondent's question immediately after the completion of talks in Moscow with Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs Francisco Fernandez-Ordonez and the signing of a number of bilateral agreements.

The talks, said the Soviet minister, encompassed as always quite a wide sphere of problems of interest to both countries. However, this time we concentrated chiefly on bilateral relations and discussed the state of affairs in the sphere of trade, economic, scientific, technical, cultural, and other ties. Aleksandr Bessmertnykh noted that in the trade and economic sphere, the USSR and Spain have potential that is as yet greatly underexploited. Things are not standing still. There are signs of forward movement. In the scientific and technical sphere, for example, there is a ten year program for developing contacts. However, it has not been effectively implemented, and today the sides agreed to look into this.

In Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's view, contacts in the cultural arena are developing very well. The Soviet side plans to participate actively in events taking place in Spain next year; in particular, in the Olympic games, the World Exhibition in Seville, and the celebrations of the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America.

Referring to international questions that were examined at today's talks between the ministers, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said that they had discussed the Yugoslav situation and the development of all-European processes—including prospects for building European structures, the relationship between the Soviet Union and the European Community, and the role that Spain could play in assisting such cooperation. "This role," the Soviet minister stressed, "is positive and has been right from the start."

Evaluating the talks as a whole, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said: "the conversation was wide-ranging. In my view, the coincidence of approaches on many questions was a cause for satisfaction. We agreed to consult each other actively on several of the most current problems, in particular the problems in the Middle East." He said that the situation developing there had been examined in the light of contacts the Soviet Union has had with Middle Eastern states and the Palestinians and contacts the Spanish minister had with the Israeli foreign minister, Levi, in Madrid. "So we had a very wide-ranging and intensive conversation about a Middle East settlement," the Soviet minister noted. "We agreed to keep in touch on this matter."

Gonzalez Speaks on Democracy

LD0807200591 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanischev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—Intolerant positions taken by political forces in society with regard to economic, national and social issues can yield no constructive solutions, but lead to instability and weaken the nation, visiting Spanish Premier Felipe Gonzalez today told students of the traditional summer school held for the first time in Moscow by the Unversidad Complutense de Madrid.

In his address on the summer school opening day, Gonzalez touched first of all on Spain's transition from the authoritarian government to a democratic variety. As is known, Felipe Gonzalez is one of the initiators and most active participants in his country's transition from the Franco dictatorship to democratic forms of government.

Gonzalez stressed that the parties and organisations involved in progressive changes should have the ability to compromise, as long as it goes not about a simple sum of political forces, but about the possibility of uniting the forces in the interests of changes. [sentence as received]

There should be room for all these forces in a new society, Gonzalez noted. He also said that impulses for political and economic reforms must come from the will of society, and qualitative changes should embrace all spheres in order to make this process irreversible. Economic freedoms, i.e. a market, should follow on the (?wills) of political freedoms, he said.

Drawing on Spain's experience, Gonzalez noted that a democratic society is constituted not by the absence of conflicts but by the recognition of the need to solve them. The best method for establishing new rules of social life, he said, is the achievement of a consensus. Consensus, he stressed, is needed for all decentralization processes, whatever spheres they may involve.

Gonzalez then replied to students' questions. Attending the meeting were Raisa Gorbachev, a member of the Presidium of the Soviet Culture Fund Board, First Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev and the Soviet Ambassador to Spain Sergey Romanovskiy.

Gonzalez Dinner Speech

CM0907122591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS Report: "A New Level in Soviet-Spanish Dialogue"]

[Text]—Below follows the text of the speech by Felipe Gonzalez, prime minister of the Spanish Government, at the dinner given here in honor of himself and his wife by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbachev.

Mr. President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics!

Ladies and Gentlemen!

My first words will be an expression of thanks on the part of my wife, myself personally, and on behalf of the Spanish delegation, for the sincere reception accorded to us and the warm words of welcome that were just pronounced by you, Mr. President.

I see in this evidence of your fine personal disposition toward us which I sincerely appreciate highly and the expression of the remarkable moment being experienced in our bilateral relations.

At our meeting today we discussed the state of the cooperation between Spain and the USSR and analyzed the changes occurring in the international situation since the moment of our first meeting in the Kremlin five years ago which was so memorable for me and the last meeting just a few months ago in Madrid.

I think that I am not exaggerating, Mr. President, by saying that if we were to put to the test our ability to predict the future in light of what appeared to be predicatable in 1986, then we would obtain an extremely good assessment.

The doors that appeared to be so tightly shut, have opened wide under the pressure of freedom. The walls that appeared to be impregnable fortresses have collapsed under the pressure of the forces of democracy. There are no longer infallible formulas for organizing the world. There are no longer divisions into good and bad.

The uncomplicated simplicity of relations based on confrontation, curtains, and artificial divisions has now given way to actual activity, much more complicated and alive, constantly exciting our imagination. We are restructuring the world, because we have clearly realized the need for changes in order to improve our citizens' standard of living and to guarantee them a fruitful and stable peace.

However, the world's profile is still not quite clearly visible in the process of evolution, in which only one thing is clear: It will be much more mutually dependent and no one will ever sacrifice freedom and respect for human rights any more for the sake of hypothetical social and economic progress.

I want to tell you, Mr. President, that in Spain we fully realize the decisive role that you personally have played in setting in motion this whole process of changes, of perestroyka, which will undoubtedly become a landmark in the history of Europe and the history of your country.

Right from the beginning the Spanish Government appraised the reform program and the policy of transformations which perestroyka brought in its wake very positively. They assessed it as the greatest renewal, the essence of which is democracy and the target of which is people.

It is natural that by virtue of the role the Soviet Union plays in the world, this entire process is being reflected in the international sphere as strongly as inside the country.

I know that one cannot compare either situations or countries like Spain and the Soviet Union which are so different in scale.

Yet I would like to express a sincere wish that your people will be able, as my people did, to resolve all the conflicts in which any transition to democracy abounds, within the framework of the constitutional legislation, on the path to creative dialogue and not confrontation and that the result of this will be a life-giving synthesis of traditions and a renewal in which the history of our two countries is so rich.

That's why we wish you great success in attaining the Union treaty, in creating a new constitution, and plans for economic reforms leading to an improvement in the Soviet people's quality of life.

In this field you can rely on the Spanish people's firm and resolute support in any way they can be of assistance.

At this time Spaniards and Soviets are together studying the Spanish experience of a peaceful transition to democracy, the essence of which amounted to a united effort to achieve a genuine and not simply a formal sovereignty of the people, our integration in Europe and in the whole world, and the overcoming of antagonistic positions.

It wasn't easy to make this historic effort. Salvador de Madariaga said: "If after Descartes the Europeans became philosophers since they went in search of the truth, we Spaniards continue to remain theologians because we proceed from the truth". Perhaps it is precisely this characteristic of ours that is able to explain both our great deeds that have spread Spanish culture to the ends of the earth and also the bloody and cruel nature of our civil wars and ultimately the integral and cyclical nature of our history.

Mr. President!

The final elimination of universal and antagonistic models gives us new opportunities for international cooperation to put an end to regional conflicts, to enter more deeply into global processes of disarmament and arms reduction and to resolve new transnational problems in a worthy fashion. And all of this is within the framework of strengthening the authority of the United Nations and the necessary observance of the principles contained in its Charter.

In Europe at the present time we bear the responsibility of capturing a historic opportunity to create a new sphere of coexistence based on values which we all share and which are contained in the Helsinki Final Act and in the Paris Charter.

The events of conflict in Yugoslavia point to the need for remaining true to one's obligations.

And, although it is true that peoples must not be forced to live together against their will, it is, however, no less true that this will can only be acceptable when it is demonstrated by peaceful dialogue, with the general agreement of the sides and within a legal framework which has been agreed on in good time.

We can not interpret the principles of international law in the light of prevailing ideologies, nor place them in a hierarchy as desired.

I think that our prime task, as European leaders, is to defend these values and norms which offer the only opportunity to ensure that the current processes of renewal and other factors do not inflict damage and are acceptable to all.

Mr. President!

Tomorrow we will sign an important treaty on friendship and cooperation which enshrines in a solemn, written form the common desire to consolidate the ties of friendship between the Spanish and Soviet peoples and to extend the machanisms of cooperation in all spheres. This treaty is based on the idea that Spain and the Soviet Union are friendly states, regulating their relations on the basis of principles aimed at overcoming the dialectic process of the division of the European Continent, and are full of resolve to unite their efforts in constructing a new Europe, a Europe more just, more in solidarity, and freer.

Our relations are thus attaining new levels of trust and cooperation, defining the mechanism of regular consultations at the highest level, and the procedure for establishing urgent contact in the event of situations arising which threaten peace on the planet, or are capable of exacerbating the international situation. It is planned to set up a direct communications line between both presidents as a means of more effective and urgent contacts and, at the same time, as a symbol of the new level of trust which we have reached in our bilateral dialogue.

However, this treaty is not limited exclusively to a bilateral framework, it opens out onto the European perspective as an important element in the architecture of the new Europe which is under construction. Thus, Spain and the Soviet Union are making their contribution to the construction of a peaceful order on a stable basis.

International cooperation, transcending the stereotypes of the "cold war", and also joint actions using the mediation of the United Nations organization have already borne their first fruits which promise much in resolving old and difficult conflicts in Africa, Asia, and Central America. This makes it possible for us to jointly seek a satisfactory political solution to other regional conflicts too, to halt bloodshed and put an end to the prolonged sufferings of many peoples.

We think, in particular, that the time has come to take serious and decisive steps to establish peace in the Near East now that we have created a framework for negotiations which will take account of the lawful interests of all the sides and the inalienable right of the Palestinian people.

Mr President!

The documents which we signed in Madrid last October and the documents which we are going to sign in Moscow tomorrow form a firm basis for juridicial, economic, and political obligations.

We are optimistic in our vision of the future of our relations. We want people working in the field of art, entrepreneurs, scientists, technical employees, and young people of both sides to establish closer human contacts which at the present moment are in sufficient. I am sure that these contacts will facilitate mutual acquaintance and deepen the friendship between our people.

Felipe Gonzalez gave a toast in honor of the friendship between the USSR and Spain, and wished happiness to Mikhail Gorbachev and his spouse, and happiness and well-being to the peoples of the USSR.

Gorbachev Dinner Speech

CM0807213791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS Report: "A New Level of Soviet-Spanish Dialogue"]

[Text]—Respected Mr. Chairman of the government!

Respected Mrs. Carmen Romero!

Ladies and Gentlemen, Comrades!

I am sincerely glad to welcome to Moscow my friend, Felipe Gonzalez, and his wife, and all the Spanish guests. Your visit is a new stage in the rising course of Soviet-Spanish dialogue, yet another wide step drawing together our peoples and countries at a new stage in their own development in the new European and international conditions.

Here everything has become intertwined, both long-standing cultural traditions and many features of the national characters, the ineffaceable sympathies of our peoples toward one another, and the historic ordeal, and the search for ways to move toward democracy, and the similarities in the extremely complicated problems of the transitional period which Spain has been through before us, and the need for an ideal that is inherent in us. All this has made us friends and interlocultors who are very much in need of one another, on a state level as well.

The conversation with you, dear Felipe, in Madrid last autumn was so substantive that I constantly think back over it and share the conclusions drawn from it with comrades.

We recalled you and your experience this winter and spring which were especially alarming for us when we managed with great difficulty to retain the process of perestroyka within a democratic and constitutional framework.

We feel the solidarity and support on the part of the Spanish people and government. Their sympathy was evidently born of the fact that freedom and democracy and their return to the family of European peoples did not come easily to the Spanish. Spain's success on this path is a reassuring sign, convincing evidence of the fact that our present crisis can also be overcome.

Nothing is capable of shaking us in the choice that has been made once and for all—to provide society with the opportunty to transform itself into one that is economically and politically free, open to the world, and living according to the norms of humanism and democracy, with respect for the law and the national equality of rights.

Much will be decided during these weeks and months. A Union treaty will be concluded, and a new great federative state will embark on its existence. Russia's position in the transformed system of union links will be determined. The anti-crisis program will begin to be implemented and we will proceed more resolutely along the road of radicalizing economic reform. A meeting lies ahead between the USSR president and the leaders of the G-7 in London. On its results depends whether a new type of worldwide economic links, impossible without our country's organic inclusion in them, can now get under way at the most crucial moment in the world process.

Hope is provided by the aspiration toward consensus which is gaining in strength in Soviet society, and the rejection of confrontational approaches to seeking optimal solutions.

Hope is nurtured by the ever greater understanding in the world of the universal, international significance of our perestroyka.

Mr. Chairman of the government! Tomorrow we will sign the first friendship and cooperation treaty between our countries. Notwithstanding all of its originality, reflecting relations actually between the USSR and Spain, it is joining the ranks of the treaties which we have concluded with other countries. It will thereby form another reliable link in the common European area being jointly created on the principles of the Paris Charter.

There is a direct and reverse connection here: Europe needs Spain and the Soviet Union, both each as integral units and in friendly mutual cooperation with each other. And they need Europe as a unity in egalitarian plurality, as a buttress of the democratic process and of common security, and as a powerful source of economic progress.

The all-European process is for the first time in history turning Europe from a cultural-civilizational concept into a multi-ethnic socio-political reality. It is now entering a stage of practical implementation of jointly elaborated principles and ideas. A great role in building an unprecedented world order and the foundations of the civilization of the future by the peoples and states of all the world awaits the new Europe, together with the United States and Canada.

Judging by everything this path will not be easy. On the one hand, we can see that integrating institutions and tendencies are strengthening, that the search is on for a balance of interests of different states such as to strengthen the European process. On the other hand, its opposite—destructive nationalism and separatism, rooted in the past—is acquiring a dangerous scope. We are all profoundly anxious about the crisis in Yugoslavia, which has taken that state, formerly one of the pillars of European stability, to the verge of civil war and schism.

Ladies and gentlemen! You have come to visit us at a watershed for the future of our country, and hence for

the whole world. Whatever the contradictions of events, the criticality and acuteness of the tendencies and opinions which are clashing, what is prevailing is the sense of responsibility for the country's remaining worth of its millenium-long history and its great destiny—to be a mighty, enterprising, and coherent force for peace and progress—for all its own peoples and for the whole of mankind. Common sense and strength of character have always prevailed in the behavior of our people in days which were critical for the motherland.

Spain, like the Soviet Union, does not just belong to one part of the world. Spanish culture and the Spanish spirit have left a strong imprint on the development of America, Asia, and Africa. And today Spain is a connecting link between Europe and other continents. It is difficult to overestimate the significance of such connecting lines which have emerged historically in mankind's progress toward a new and more just and humane era.

Mr. Chairman of the government, dear Felipe! Thanks to you Spain and the Soviet Union have over these years drawn much closer to one another. We greatly appreciate this, and cherish the fine Soviet- Spanish cooperation and the sincerity and benevolence of our relations.

I am genuinely satisfied with our conversation today. It has, as always, enriched us. It has made it possible to look afresh into the depths of the pressing problems of modern times. It has reaffirmed the high level of coincidence of views and assessments, and readiness for broad cooperation.

To the flourishing of Soviet-Spanish relations, to the health of Mrs. Carmen Romero and Mr. Felipe Gonzalez! To the health of all those present!

Pavlov, Gonzalez Discuss Reforms, Ties

LD0907082191 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 9 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov met his visiting Spanish counterpart in Moscow on Monday.

The two discussed political, economic and social reforms in the Soviet Union. Gonzalez said Soviet reforms were unique and required careful consideration of the country's specific conditions.

Changes going on in the Soviet Union have great international importance and people in Spain watch them with deep sympathy, he said.

Special attention is being paid to work on the new Union treaty, because at this stage efforts to consolidate the country and find an optimal balance between the republics' rights and responsibility are crucial for perestroyka's success, he said.

Gonzalez was informed about work on new principles for economic relations within the union, the implementation of the anti-crisis programme and opportunities opening up before foreign partners on the Soviet market.

While discussing trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and Spain, special attention was paid to promising directions for a broad and mutually-beneficial cooperation between the two countries.

These directions include the energy industry, the chemical industry, machine-building and the creation of ventures in the light, food and other socially-important industries.

Several new agreements between Spain and the Soviet Union, including in crediting and financing, set the stage for more active contacts between Spanish and Soviet business circles, Gonzalez said.

The talks were held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Friendship, Cooperation Treaty

LD0907100391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0933 GMT 9 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow 9 Jul (TASS)—The signing in the Kremlin today of a treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Spain was the culimination of the official visit to the Soviet Union by Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez. Mikhail Gorbachev and Felipe Gonzalez ratified the document with their signatures.

The agreement is the first political document regulating bilateral relations in all key directions in the entire history of ties between the USSR and Spain. It can rightly be placed alongside similar international legal acts signed earlier by the Soviet Union and Italy, France, and the FRG, which are part of the nascent system of European security and cooperation.

Gorbachev-Gonzalez Talks

CM0907104191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 1,5

[TASS report: "Soviet-Spanish Summit Meeting"]

[Text] USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Felipe Gonzalez, chairman of the Spanish Government, continued their friendly dialogue in the Kremlin 8 July. They noted that their previous meeting in Madrid had an enormous impact on the whole range of relations between the two countries and on the process of rapprochement between the Soviet and Spanish peoples.

In describing the atmosphere in which this visit by Felipe Gonzalez—one of the leading political figures of our time—is taking place, the president noted that the Soviet Union is constantly aware of Spanish solidarity and values it. We are not just in solidarity, added Felipe Gonzalez, we have a passionate interest in the success of perestroyka.

As always their conversation was wide-ranging in its ideas, analysis of events and processes, and in its conclusions. The significance of contacts between these two leaders for both of them was again confirmed, as was the importance for both of them in political as well as in personal terms of their profound mutual trust, sincerity, and plain speaking.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Felipe Gonzalez exchanged opinions on the international and European situation at the end of the "cold war," taking into account the consequences of the crisis in the Persian Gulf. They assessed the position and prospects of their countries primarily in the European context. Felipe Gonzalez talked about the organic link between the problems of Spanish society and the processes of integration within the EC and about the challenge which Spain is facing at the new levels of integration in Europe.

He talked about the significance in these conditions of social accord, without which there can be no guarantee for the competitiveness of the Spanish economy, and that means, for its healthy development and the welfare of the population.

Mikhail Gorbachev described the situation in the country in detail. He added to and elaborated on a great deal of what he had already said to Felipe Gonzalez in Madrid, and even before that during their first meeting in Moscow, about the deep-seated reasons why it is so difficult for society to emerge from the former system, about the legacy of post-Stalinism which is still far from eradicated, about neo-Stalinism as a current reality, and about the burden of problems stemming from the past in interethnic relations, in which for decades the very essence of the equal rights of nations and the sovereignty of republics was distorted and everything that was in contradiction with the unitary state was suppressed, and sometimes repressed.

On the other hand public awareness, aroused by democracy and the free press, came under the influence of new and contradictory trends and slogans, including extremist and blatantly destructive ones. In an atmosphere of economic crisis linked with the inevitable destruction of the totalitarian system of management, political confrontation hardened. By spring it reached the critical mark. The situation was defused through the "Nine plus One" agreement, which came to the rescue and marked the start of the trend toward accord and stabilization. But this process needs constant development and enrichment by means of the Union treaty, by the thorough radicalization of economic reform, and by overcoming the disorganization of the market. This indeed is the aim of state work at present at various levels.

Mikhail Gorbachev gave reasons why there is a need for the Soviet economy to be organically integrated into the European and world economy, something which would mean a new type of international economic relations.

Felipe Gonzalez expressed some profound thoughts regarding this matter, basing them on Spanish and European experience. He gave a critical analysis of the correlation of programs of reforms, even the most perfect ones, and practical economic policy, real life.

Both leaders expressed their opinions and suggestions regarding the forthcoming meeting of the USSR president with the leaders of the "Big Seven" in London. Mikhail Gorbachev acquainted Gonzalez with the main elements of concept which he is going to set forth there.

During the conversation great attention was paid to the problem of political stability, which is now also of key significance for economic development. Without it the flows of capital will not go to those places where they are particularly necessary as additional and auxiliary means for improving the economy and for consolidating positive internal and international transformations.

As for the Soviet Union, on which stability in Europe and in the world depends, the decisive point here—and there was a thorough discussion of it during the conversation—is the conclusion of a Union treaty. This would become, in Felipe Gonzalez's opinion, the core of centripetal tendencies, just like the European Community in West Europe.

Both leaders spoke in favor of concluding a political treaty between the USSR and European Communities which could become one of the guarantees of stability in the whole of Europe.

During the transitional period after the "cold war" Europe was given principles and standards for moving toward a new era in its history by the Paris Charter. However, the absence of effective mechanisms for the implementation of all-European ideas affected this most crucial period.

It was with great concern that Felipe Gonzalez and Mikhail Gorbachev discussed the situation in Yugoslavia. They consider that the Yugoslav crisis has come as a distinctive test of the capacity of Europeans to act sensibly and consistently, with full understanding of their common responsibility, avoiding double standards in their approach to events and arbitrary interpretation of the provisions of the charter for Europe while also observing the fundamental requirements for stability—the inviolability of frontiers, non-interference in internal affairs, assistance only through the sovereign government, and encouragement of exclusively constitutional methods of resolving internal conflicts. Otherwise, there may be, to quote Felipe Gonzalez, "dark days" ahead for Europe.

The response to separatism and nationalism should not be the use of military force; but the temptation to use separatism and nationalism for interests beyond the state concerned and for purposes characteristic of the "cold war" is also a dangerous one.

The theme of the fate of the socialist ideal is a traditional one for meetings between Mikhail Gorbachev and Felipe Gonzalez, who are general secretaries of their parties. They talked frankly about program aims, about the situation within the party, and about the fact that if a party or any part of it prizes above all else "the badge of quality of its past," then it loses grounds for legitimacy in the struggle to come to power through free democratic elections.

The meeting will continue on 9 July.

More on Gorbachev, Kohl Press Conference

PM0807153391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[UKRINFORM-TASS report: "News Conference in Mezhigorye"]

[Text] Kiev, 5 Jul—At the conclusion of the talks between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and FRG Federal Chancellor H. Kohl in the small town of Mezhigorye near Kiev the two countries' leaders met with journalists. Opening the news conference, M.S. Gorbachev said:

I welcome Mr. Chancellor to the Soviet Union, here, near Kiev—the capital of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. Mr Kohl and I have already had many meetings, exchanges of letters, and telephone conversations. And each meeting—whether an official or a working meeting, lasting several days or a short time—has, without exaggeration, constituted a new step toward rapprochement and the intensification of the political dialogue and cooperation. Mr. Kohl and I are meeting after the entire world community and our countries recently marked the 50th anniversary of the start of the war. During these days the governments of both states and the public in our countries have noted the tremendous path we have traveled toward each other—in the direction of not just reconciliation but also cooperation. We have concluded major agreements between our countries, agreements that are historic in terms of their significance, thrust and scale.

It was with this that my conversation with Mr. Chancellor began today, and then we spent five hours intesively discussing problems which embrace our bilateral relations. I must say that we tried very hard not to omit a single main question, although we already have such a volume of cooperation that it is becoming increasingly hard to do this. Therefore Mr. Chancellor and I asked our staffers to conduct their own dialogue in parallel. So, ten hours of fruitful, intensive talks. For me this time and pace is familiar in the perestroyka period, but Mr. Chancellor also has his own perestroyka now, although he calls it differently. In him I found a partner who actively supported such a pace of conversation. We exchanged information. First of all, at the chancellor's request, I spoke about the processes taking place in our country today. Mr. Chancellor was particularly interested in the way the process of building up and strengthening public concord is developing and in the way the work on the Union Treaty is progressing at the concluding stage. This news conference will mark the end of my work program, but Mr. Chancellor still has to talk with the Ukraine's leadership.

Mr. Chancellor and I spent a very long time talking in detail, first one-on-one and then with the participation of our aides, about the upcoming meeting of "the seven." This topic took up a lot of our time. And we believe that it deserves it, for it is a question not only of a symbolic event but also of a really very significant one, which in itself indicates that positive changes are occurring in the world. We compared our approaches and assessments and asked each other difficult questions, but I saw the German chancellor's great interest in and solidarity with what we are doing in the Soviet Union. We also did not overlook questions of European development, but maybe I will not endeavor to take stock of everything and will leave something for Mr. Kohl. I merely wish to say that this meeting has advanced our cooperation. I also consider it very important that it has taken place in the atmosphere of partnership, cooperation, and mutual understanding which is now traditional for our meetings.

H. Kohl: First of all, I would like to take the opportunity to cordially thank you, Mr. President, on my own behalf and also on behalf of my staffers, for the hospitality shown us here, in the Ukraine. It is a portentous fact that we are meeting here just a few days after the 50th anniversary of fascist Germany's attack on the Soviet Union. And during our intensive, long, and good talks today I repeatedly thought of the fact that a time has come when the development of events is, at last, heading in a better direction. On our way from Borispol we stopped for a few minutes in one of Kiev's main streets and talked with passersby there. One Kiev resident said there: We want a good joint future. And I can say: this is correct. Precisely such a common philosophy lay at the basis of the German-Soviet treaty. While not forgetting the past, we are fully resolved to move to a peaceful future and to build it actively together.

And this fully accords with the level of relations between our countries and, above all, with the level of the personal relationship between President Gorbachev and myself. From the very lengthy talks today I would like to single out just one topic. We will be seeing each other again in a few days' time at the summit meeting of "the seven" in London, and there too President Gorbachev will speak about the progress of the reforms being implemented here, in the Soviet Union. About the very important reform at the level of the Union and the republics, about the Union Treaty, and about the course of the economic transformations. Both things are interconnected.

Here I would also like to say very definitely and clearly to all male and female citizens of the Soviet Union, without interfering in your country's internal affairs: The success

of the reforms in the Soviet Union accords not only with the interests of the Soviet Union's population but also with the interests of all Europeans, including my German compatriots. The success of perestroyka and the success of the country's turning to face the rest of the world is also a success for the cause of peace. Tremendous changes have occurred in a few years. Talks like those today would have been inconceivable just five years ago. Therefore I am optimistically inclined. And together with my colleagues I will advocate in London that we give joint support, to the extent of our ability and strength, to the reforms process and the process of openness, and even before the London meeting I will telephone some of my colleagues, endeavoring to do everything to ensure that we can make a joint effort to promote the successful progress of the reform process in the USSR.

Question: Will today's accords promote the republics' more active involvement in international cooperation, and, incidentally, did L.M. Kravchuk participate in the talks?

M.S. Gorbachev: Meetings are taking place between the president of the Soviet Union and the chancellor of Germany and, as I have already said, after the news conference the chancellor will have a meeting with the leadership of the Ukraine. Yes, when we speak of the development of the Soviet Union's ties—economic, political—with other countries, what we have in mind is the new state and quality which distinguishes our present union state, and this new quality is associated with the fact that the initiative and the contribution of all the republics in all spheres—not only in domestic politics but also in foreign policy—will be different and more significant. And this will accord with the real sovereignty which already exists today and which will, I hope, be enshrined in the new Union Treaty in the very near future.

Question: Mr. Gorbachev, did you promise Federal Chancellor Kohl that the Soviet troops temporarily stationed on German territory will continue to be withdrawn according to schedule and that the Soviet Union will not make any additional demands?

M.S. Gorbachev: I realize there is an allusion in your question, but I think these allusions proceed from both sides. I do not believe, however, that this constitutes the essence of the process. Both sides remain devoted to the treaty between them, a very important treaty. This is not an easy problem—it is not only an economic one but, above all, a human one. We have an understanding about this too, and I wish to take this opportunity to say: We greatly value the fact that at this specific, transitional time the government of united Germany, political and public circles, and ordinary people are showing both respect and, what is more, a friendly disposition. I consider this very important. By taking this attitude to the Soviet soldier, the German people are demonstrating their principled position with regard to the Soviet Union. We welcome this and believe that we must resolve the task facing us by means of joint efforts, within the framework of the accord that has been reached.

Question: Were you convinced of your partner's solidarity during the talks? Could you explain in what spheres specifically this solidarity is manifested on the eve of the meeting in London?

M.S. Gorbachev: First of all, I wish to say that I value highly the solidarity of the FRG Government and the German people with our people. This solidarity is manifested in an understanding of the importance and significance of our perestroyka and our reforms and in the desire to actively support, as far as possible, the perestroyka processes.

The German Government and Mr. Kohl personally have expounded their viewpoint concerning the significance of our perestroyka for the whole world, and they do this constantly, competently, and in a well-reasoned manner. This is not to mention credits, commodity exchange, economic ties, and the realization of projects.

H. Kohl: I believe that Mr. President has given an exhaustive reply, and I can only emphasize once again my own personal position. Relations between Russians and Germans have a very long history. In it there have been both good times and terrible times. We are now approaching the end of the 20th century. So let us now write together—you and we—a good new chapter of our common history. A new path was opened up for us by the results of last year's summit meeting in the Caucasus. We have newly acquired both the unity of Germany and the unity of Europe, having overcome the split in them.

Question: Mr. Chancellor, on a more specific plane what do you expect of the meeting of "the seven" in London? Is it possible to expect of it any decisions aimed at supporting the USSR in the implementation of reforms in the state and in the economy?

H. Kohl: This question can only be answered in detail after the conference in London. Today I can only speak of what I personally expect and what I hope for in connection with this meeting. The very fact, above all, of Mikhail Gorbachev's presence in London is an exceptionally important event for me. In our fast-moving times everything is quickly forgotten. Not even at last year's meeting in the Caucasus were we in any way able to predict that something similar would happen. First, I—and other colleagues with me—will advocate that everyone should understand that the success of the policy of reforms in the USSR will be an important achievement not only for Soviet people but also for all of us in Europe, for such success will serve the cause of peace. President Gorbachev will expound his concept in London, I will speak with him on this subject, and specific conclusions will be drawn from these talks. It cannot be ruled out, for example, that the Soviet Union will be able to enter into cooperation within the framework of the IMF as an associated member of it. Very specific consequences will stem from this cooperation—

for example, capital investments, investment by Western countries in the Soviet Union's economy, and much besides. I hope to be able to give a more exhaustive reply right after the London meeting. But today I must confine myself just to forecasts.

Question: Is it true that a top-level meeting between the United States and the USSR will be held in Moscow 25 July? Do you intend to join the movement which advocates the unification of democratic forces and leave the post of general secretary?

M.S. Gorbachev: The date for a meeting between the presidents of the USSR and the United States has not yet been fixed. Maybe you have gotten mixed up—a plenum of the party's Central Committee devoted to a discussion of the CPSU Program opens 25 July. But you have probably noticed that the presidents of the Soviet Union and the United States have expressed a desire to give corresponding instructions and impetus to those who are preparing the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms for signing. We have raised the level of the "negotiators" in Geneva and exchanged letters with the President on these issues with specific proposals, and progress is being made. And I do not rule out the possibility that the meeting could take place in July.

As for my position concerning the democratic movement, which it is proposed to organize in the country, it boils down to the following: I welcome any democratic movements within the framework of perestroyka, which are emerging, it has to be said, practically not only monthly but also weekly. We need concord in society, we need the radicalization of the reforms, and we must emerge onto a new level of cooperation. The "Nine plus One" accord works for this concord, the preparation of the Union Treaty works for this concord, and the creation of a very broad group acting from constructive positions in the corps of deputies also works to this end. A movement which invites all progressive, democratic forces to cooperate in the interests of the success of the policy of perestroyka, if it preserves this nature and this thrust, will meet only with a positive attitude on my part.

Question: Mr. President, what impact are the events taking place in Yugoslavia having on the situation in the Soviet Union?

M.S. Gorbachev: They once again remind us all how we depend on each other, how attentive we must be toward each other, and how important it is to follow the Helsinki process and the principles of the Paris charter. And if this situation is taking such an acute turn for Yugoslavia, for Europe, and for all of us, then this is a lesson for the peoples of the Soviet Union, a lesson and a warning. Observing our perestroyka, particularly in the sphere of interethnic relations, I have arrived at the conclusion that the country, the commonwealth, and the community of peoples which has taken shape over 1,000 years essentially constitute a fusion in which human destinies and the destinies of peoples and cultures have inseparably merged, where the economy has evolved on the basis of a profound division of labor and cooperative ties, where people did not even think of borders and only 30 percent of the borders were confirmed by state acts. And so we cannot separate. Such a separation would be fraught with a tremendous risk and would lead to unpredictable grave consequences. Since then I have become a most committed and ardent supporter of the Soviet Union's profound reformation so as to implement in practice the formula according to which the new, renewed union federation must be a union of sovereign states. And this must be accompanied by a redistribution of powers and must create an atmosphere in which every people will feel confident.

This is why I believe that what is happening and what we are all living through—and I have spoken with Mr. Chancellor about Yugoslavia—must once again make us all think and realize that we must take the path of renewal, not disintegration. I will not deviate from this road and this position under any pressure. When we were going along the Kreshchatik, a group of "Rukh" supporters tried to set up a slanging match. Well, there probably still are people who have not had their fill of shouting, and they had to take the opportunity which presented itself to let off steam. But let us not forget also that almost three-fourths of the voters here advocated the Union in the referendum. And no one has the right to ignore the people's will.

Latin America & Caribbean

Further on Visit of Mexico's President Salinas

Joint Declaration Issued

CM0807150991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

["Soviet-Mexican Joint Declaration"]

[Text] At the invitation of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, Carlos Salinas de Gortari, president of the United Mexican States, was on an official visit to the Soviet Union 3-5 July 1991. During the talks, the presidents discussed a broad range of topical international problems, as well as various aspects of the political, economic, and social processes in the USSR and Mexico. Attention was focused on an analysis of bilateral ties. A common point of view was expressed on the importance of implementing additional specific steps aimed at strengthening Soviet-Mexican relations and elevating them to a level which corresponds to both countries' economic potential and their effective participation in the new processes of world development.

President Carlos Salinas de Gortari, expressing the mood of the people and the government of Mexico, voiced good wishes for success in implementing the profound changes that are taking place in the USSR and spoke about his interest in the Soviet Union playing a dynamic, innovative, and constructive role in the world arena in the future.

In acknowledging President Mikhail Gorbachev's contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and creating a new climate of detente and trust between peoples, the Mexican president particularly emphasized his satisfaction with the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the Soviet leader and noted his leading role in the practical implementation of the broad range of reforms aimed at improving the well-being of Soviet society.

President Mikhail Gorbachev thanked President Carlos Salinas de Gortari for his friendly wishes for the Soviet people and the USSR Government, stressing that people in the Soviet Union have great affection and respect for the Mexican people. He praised Mexico's prominent and growing role in international affairs.

The sides noted with satisfaction that the rich traditions of friendship and cooperation accumulated over a history of relations between the two countries stretching back for more than a century create a firm foundation for making progress in developing ties between the USSR and the United Mexican States in all areas and for bringing the Soviet and Mexican peoples closer together.

The presidents agreed that the present development of the international situation is marked by the existence of positive changes, which are the result of the transition from confrontation and the "Cold War" to a phase which constitutes the search for mutual understanding and cooperation by states in tackling international problems and in stepping up efforts aimed at promoting co-operation for the sake of development. They noted that the USSR and Mexico are building their relations on the basis of strict observance of the spirit and letter of the UN Charter and of other principles and norms of international law.

The sides emphasized that the affirmation in international affairs of the pre-eminence of the values and interests of all mankind and of the right of peoples to the free choice of their path of development is fundamental for bringing the new world order into being.

They are in favor of excluding the use of force from interstate relations, or the threat of its use, and any actions which represent interference in the internal affairs of other states.

The Soviet Union and Mexico express their willingness to continue to contribute to strengthening positive trends in the world arena. They are convinced of the key significance of the United Nations as the main forum for the coordination of the world community's efforts to ensure peace, security, and cooperation among states and for the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts, and spoke in favor of enhancing its effectiveness in solving political, economic, ecological, humanitarian, and other global problems.

The sides stress that to maintain peace and security and to release resources for international cooperation for development, it is important to continue efforts in the interests of achieving accords at bilateral and multilateral disarmament negotiations. In this context, both sides confirm their support for steps to ensure the nonproliferation and elimination of nuclear, chemical, and other weapons of mass destruction and the cessation of nuclear tests. They called on the international community to strengthen the regime of the treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America (the Tlatelolco Treaty).

The USSR and Mexico favor curbing the quantitative and qualitative conventional arms race in the world, limiting and reducing armed forces and military spending significantly, and establishing international controls on arms supplies, and they declare their determination to promote the achievement of these goals in practice.

The sides noted the positive changes occurring in Latin America and, in particular, the efforts directed at achieving regional integration. In the Soviet side's view, progress in this sphere will help restore the pace of economic growth of the region's countries. In this regard, Mexico's important role in giving impetus to the development of mechanisms for such cooperation was noted. The sides also emphasized the coincidence of their positions on the need to seek solutions to Central America problems at the negotiating table, in particular, ways to achieve a peaceful settlement in El Salvador, and gave a high appraisal of the role being played by the United Nations. The Mexican side stated its desire to assist in increasing the economic development of the countries of East and Central Europe, for which purpose it intends to take part in the elaboration of joint action programs within the framework of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, to which Mexico belongs.

The sides confirmed their interest in strengthening and diversifying the forms of economic cooperation in the Pacific region. In this regard the Soviet side expressed its satisfaction at Mexico's official admission to the Conference for Pacific Economic Cooperation. Mexico expressed firm support for the USSR's desire to accede to this organization. Both sides consider that the Soviet and Mexican participation in the conference will make it possible to expand their bilateral economic cooperation within the regional framework.

The sides stressed the importance of achieving an acceptable solution to the problem of foreign indebtedness in the interests of the healthy development of the world economy.

The Soviet side has noted the significant progress attained by Mexico in the area of rescheduling its foreign debt.

The sides have expressed their common view that the conditions and trends in modern world development demand that countries get involved with global economic processes and strengthen their production base by means of carrying out an open economic policy that

should encourage an increase in the competitiveness of their goods in foreign markets.

The Soviet Union and Mexico noted that economic isolationism and self-sufficiency are fraught with adverse consequences and costs.

The Soviet Union and Mexico have emphasized that it is necessary for the activities of regional economic organizations to encourage an increase in the exchange of goods on a global level. In this context, the importance of efforts to create a free trade zone in North America have been noted.

In the view of the Mexican side, the economic changes taking place in the USSR and its efforts toward integration into the world economic system, including contacts with the European Community and other countries in Europe, and also its joining international trade and hard-currency and financial organizations, are positive in character and correspond to the interests of all the peoples of the world.

The Soviet side demonstrated a particular interest in the steps undertaken by the Mexican Government in the area of economic and financial reform and in establishing mechanisms for the interaction of various levels of Mexican society in the interests of satisfying its needs. The implementation of the "Solidarity" program and the results achieved have attracted attention.

The Soviet side also voiced profound interest for a closer familiarization with, and study of, the Mexican experience of implementing the decentralization and privatization of state-owned enterprises. Both countries agreed to broaden and intensify cooperation in this field.

The USSR and Mexico are fully aware of the serious danger of adverse changes in the ecological sphere and have announced that development should not be based on squandering natural resources and destroying the environment. Both sides agreed to promote the achievement of constructive results at the UN conference on environment and development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

The Soviet side gave a positive assessment of the activity of the Mexican Government for the protection of nature, and expressed satisfaction with the fact that President Carlos Salinas de Gortari had been awarded the "Single Earth" prize.

To strengthen and diversify their bilateral relations, the sides agreed to open talks on the conclusions of a general agreement on cooperation which is set to become the main act, fixed by treaty, in the area of political, economic, trade, cultural, scientific, and technological relations between the two countries.

The sides agreed to develop and deepen the bilateral political dialogue on the basis of the memorandum on mutual understanding between the Soviet and Mexican Governments, which was signed in April 1991 and involves setting up a mechanism of consultations between the two countries' Foreign Ministries on the issues of mutual interest.

The two sides voiced their readiness to render assistance to the broadening and diversification of trade exchanges, the activation of economic, industrial, scientific, and technological cooperation, and their readiness to continue their work directed at the implementation of a long-term program for trade, economic, scientific, and technological cooperation signed on 13 June 1989.

The Soviet Union and Mexico agreed to encourage concerted efforts to develop of new forms of cooperation including industrial coproduction, create joint ventures and compensatory deals, exchange technologies, and develop interbank cooperation. The sides expressed their satisfaction with the fact that Mexican companies took part in the process of reconstructing and modernizing the Baku refinery works, as well as with the fact that Soviet organizations participated in the construction of the "Aguamilpa" hydro-electric power station. These two facts reveal that the two countries have possibilities for economic coproduction.

The Soviet Union and Mexico spoke in favor of further cooperation in various areas of fundamental and applied science that are mutally interesting, including agriculture and lumber industry, power engineering, environment protection, chemistry, biology, math, seismology, and so on.

The sides concluded an agreement on cooperation in the field of the research and use of space for peaceful purposes and by this agreement the sides wanted to contribute to its strength and development.

Taking account of the possibility of natural calamities which result in casualties and material damage and of the experience acquired by both nations in their overcoming of consequences of such natural calamities, the sides signed an agreement on scientific and technological cooperation in the field of protecting the population and preventding natural calamities.

In the fight against the illegal distribution and abuse of narcotics and drugs, both sides agreed to establish mechanisms for bilateral cooperation, and with this end in view, they signed an agreement on cooperation in the fight against the illegal distribution of narcotics and psychotropic substances.

The sides expressed their satisfaction with the direct automatic telephone link that has been set up between the Soviet Union and Mexico.

The sides spoke of their readiness to start talks on the issue of the mutual acceptance and equivalence of their study courses, education documents and academic degrees. Agreement has been reached on jointly drawing-up a program of cultural and scientific exchanges for

1992-93 with the aim of giving a new impulse to bilateral links in the field of culture and science.

The sides evaluated highly the results of the visit by President Carlos Salinas de Gortari, and expressed their certainty that the joint efforts of the USSR and Mexico will have a positive effect upon the formation of the structures of the world order on the threshold of the 21st Century.

President Carlos Salinas de Gortari thanked President Mikhail Gorbachev for the attention shown to him during his stay in the Soviet Union and confirmed his invitation to the USSR president to visit Mexico. The invitation was gratefully received.

Concludes Visit, Departs 5 Jul

LD0507092991 Moscow TASS in English 0903 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—President Carlos Salinas de Gortari today left Moscow for home, ending his official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of President Mikhail Gorbachev.

At Moscow's Sheremetyevo Airport, where Mexican and Soviet flags flew, Soviet officials, including Vice-President Gennady Yanayev and Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, saw off the Mexican president.

A guard of honour was formed, and the two countries' national anthems were played.

Supreme Soviet

Compliance Committee Approves Union Treaty

LD0807105591 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—The Committee on Constitutional Compliance today circulated a release in the Soviet parliament, saying that the new draft Union treaty does not violate the Soviet Constitution.

The committee said it "did not discover any violations of the Soviet Constitution and republican constitutions or infringement on the authority of supreme bodies of the Union and republics in the organisation of work on the draft Union treaty".

"On the whole, the draft treaty deserves approval", the committee said.

The body said it was necessary to clarify certain legal aspects in the draft.

It suggested to include in the draft a provision saying that the 1977 USSR Constitution and republican constitutions remain in force until the passage of new constitutions in so far as they do not violate the Union treaty.

In addition, under the draft treaty, the Union is not recognised as a subject of the right to ownership, it says.

Meanwhile, a sovereign state, and the Union is recognised as such, cannot function without its own property. The committee suggested including in the treaty a provision under which the Union will own the means of the Union budget and the property of Union bodies.

It called for the inclusion in the treaty of the following two principles: republics enjoy financial independence and cover their state expenses with their own incomes, and republics shall cover all-Union expenses equally with union taxes and fees levied on the territory of all subjects of the federation and with established allocations from republican taxes to the union budget.

The committee noted contradictions in the powers of the Union and constituent states. Under the draft treaty, both the Union and republics are declared sovereign states. Union laws should not be suspended by republican laws and republican laws by Union laws, the committee said.

Republics should only be able to protest Union laws and the Union should be able to protest republican laws in an independent judicial body—the USSR Constitutional Court—that will decide such issues and suspend a controversial laws during the argument.

The negotiating process and the signing ceremony should be attended not only by delegations of member-republics but also by a delegation of the Union, the committee said.

This is due to the fact that after the treaty enters into force, supreme bodies of the Union set up under the current constitution will continue to function. This will ensure continuity of power during the transition.

The Soviet parliament is expected to discuss the draft Union treaty on Thursday and Friday.

Gorbachev Proposes Bankruptcy Bill

OW0807120891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1030 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Gorbachev has submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet a bill on the insolvency (bankruptcy) of enterprises. The bill has already been considered by several committees, which decided that it would be an important element of the market mechanism. They recommended that the current fifth session of the Supreme Soviet give the bill its first reading.

The other bill submitted by the President is entitled On Penalties for Illegal Acts Imperilling Sea Navigation and Artificial Installations in the Sea. In an explanatory note, the President says that this kind of law is necessary to bring the Soviet legislation into conformity with the international convention and protocol of 1988 on the security of sea navigation, and of stationary platforms on the continental shelf.

Bill Approved at First Reading

LD0807121591 Moscow TASS in English 1149 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—Some 13 per cent of Soviet enterprises, accounting for three to five per cent of industrial output, could go bankrupt next year under a new bankruptcy bill debated in the Soviet parliament.

The parliament passed the first reading of the bill in a 343 to 5 vote today, signalling to heavily subsidised enterprises that they better trim up or face bankruptcy.

The bill is expected to enter into force in the fourth quarter of this year and the first bankruptcies could be recorded in the country already next year. Under the bill an enterprise is considered bankrupt if it does not pay its bills for three or more months.

"Those who enter a market should be fully responsible for themselves and should not hide behind the state's back," First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov told the legislature, presenting the bill.

"It is better to lose five per cent of the output, but to serve notice to everybody that a market is no laughing matter," he said.

However, the bill envisages bonuses for enterprises selling their products at fixed state prices at a loss, he said.

An enterprise will be declared bankrupt by a court on the basis of a statement by the debtor or its creditors.

The debtor can request the bankruptcy case to be suspended and suggest an amicable settlement to creditors, asking for a postponement of payments on his debt.

Political Rehabilitation Bill Debated

LD0807143291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Excerpts] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Here is Olga Vasilenko from the All-Union Radio correspondent post in the Kremlin.

[Vasilenko] [passage omitted] The first reading of the USSR bill on the rehabilitation of the victims of political repression and on the procedure for restoring the rights of rehabilitated persons: This legislative act stipulates the rehabilitation of those who have not been rehabilitated before, and who were subjected to repression between the years 1920 and 1959 on social, class-related, national, or religious grounds, or for other political reasons, or if they were sentenced by non-court bodies: the GPU [State Political Directorate February-December 1922], OGPU [United State Political Directorate 1922-1934], NKVD [People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs], MGBV [Ministry of State Security], dvoika's, or troika's [bodies consisting respectively of two and three officials]. The rehabilitation also covers those who were exiled [ssylka], deported [vysylka], sent to special settlements [spetsposeleniya], as well as those who suffered enforced treatement in psychiatric clinics. It is also envisaged to rehabilitate those who were sentenced on political grounds between 1960 and 1988, for crimes the responsibility for which was later annulled by other legislative acts. The legislation also deals with individuals deprived of citizenship and with those exiled from the country for political reasons. It states that it is necesary to return their citizenship to them.

The bill defines the procedure for checking dossiers in issuing rehabilitation papers. I would like to draw your special attention to Article 7 of the bill: All the sociopolitical and civil rights of which the rehabilitated persons were deprived due to repression are being restored. Their military ranks and special titles, and awards and medals will be restored, and they will be compensated for damage. They are granted benefits according to the procedure specified by laws and other normative acts of the USSR and republics. [passage omitted]

Of course one often hears that now that rehabilitation is on, literally everybody is being rehabilitated—including those who caused damage to the state and who were, indeed, guilty. However, the bill certainly does specify the cases and individuals to which the rehabilitation law is not applicable. [passage omitted]

Bill Approved at First Reading

LD0807170191 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—The Soviet parliament today considered a bill aiming to rehabilitate victims of political repressions and restore their rights.

"This bill places rehabilitation on a legal basis, defines the procedure for rehabilitation and reasons for which persons cannot be rehabilitated," said Andrey Sebentsov, a member of the parliamentary committee for legislation and legal order, as he presented the bill.

He also stressed that the bill "establishes a simplified procedure for rehabilitation encompassing those who were repressed between 1920 and 1959 and those who suffered repressions between 1960 and 1988. He recalled that political articles of the criminal code were null and void since 1989.

The bill provides for the rehabilitation of people who were repressed without guilt. Each of them, or their relatives, will be issued an official certificate, which will serve as the legal tender for the restoration of their rights and possible material compensation. The state is expected to spend up to 1.5 billion roubles a year to pay compensation to people who suffered from repressions—80 roubles per month spent in captivity by each person who was repressed without guilt.

"Rehabilitation of victims of political repressions is linked to efforts to overcome vestiges of the past, the need to purge one's conscience and think over our history, Arkadiy Sebentsov stressed.

According to Sebentsov, the passing of the bill will demonstrate "the desire to give up terrorist methods of governing society, to restore justice with respect to innocent sufferers and to guarantee future legality in the state on the basis of human rights acknowledged by the world community and to start a new count of renewed statehood from this viewpoint".

The bill was approved in first reading by a vote of 316 in favour, 13 against and 25 abstentions.

Pugo Reports Worsening Situation in NKAO

LD0807164791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1602 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Excerpt] Moscow, 8 Jul (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov: Several days after the publication of the USSR president's decree on lifting the state of emergency in two rayons of Nagorno-Karabakh adjoining Armenia, the situation there has once again sharply deteriorated. This was reported today by Boris Pugo, USSR Minister of internal affairs, at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In his words, on 6 July subunits of Azerbaijan's Ministry of Internal Affairs tried to carry out passport checks in three villages in Geranboyskiy rayon—Erkech, Munashit, and Buzluk. However, they were met with fire from Armenian militants. As a result three militia employees were killed and 10 were wounded on the Azerbaijani side, together with two KGB employees. There were also casualities on the Armenian side: According to preliminary data one person died and four were wounded.

In connection with this, Boris Pugo issued instructions to the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs to take the situation in Geranboyskiy rayon in hand. "Preliminary investigation has shown that the village of Erkech has been turned into a reinforced rayon: Last night from 500 to 1,000 militants, armored troop carriers and siege guns were concentrated there, and many trenches were dug," the minister stated.

Boris Pugo stressed that in order to settle the conflict it is essential "to convince the Armenian side to withdraw the militants and to leave all the weaponry behind." "We need to try to avoid whipping up passions and to overcome the conflict peacefully," he said. [passage omitted]

Katushev Rejected as Deputy Prime Minister

LD0807114191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1000 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] The morning session of the USSR Supreme Soviet opened today with an issue concerning the Cabinet of Ministers of the country. What was under discussion was the appointment of Katushev to the posts of the USSR deputy prime minister and minister of foreign economic relations. It was the president who asked parliament to support Katushev's candidacy, and he received support for it in the appropriate parliamentary committees and commissions.

After the debates on the candidacy, a vote was taken. However, it did not give the necessary majority, and the question was removed from the agenda. As a number of the session's participants insisted, it has been decided to return to the question at the end of the day.

Supreme Soviet 8 July Proceedings

LD0807210891

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1840 GMT on 8 July carries 45 minutes of recorded highlights of the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin on 8 July.

The announcer says that the Supreme Soviet's work will end this week.

The morning session started with a discussion of Konstantin Katushev, minister for external economic relations', nomination as deputy prime minister. Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov is shown making a presentation. There is no voice recording. Deputies reject Katushev as deputy prime minister.

At 1843 GMT Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov speaks about the draft law on bankruptcy: Those entering the market must be aware that they are responsible for their actions, that they are risking their own incomes. They will now risk losing all their capital and property. In this respect, enterprises can no longer fall back on the state when things go wrong, but are now answerable themselves. Those entering the market now have to work together with others. Therefore the law will protect those who suffer as a result of economic losses. The law will protect the property interests of the partner if the enterprise goes bankrupt. Enterprises must pay accounts within three months. The various procedures for holding enterprises responsible are outlined.

Shcherbakov then outlines possibilities for aiding ailing enterprises. The law may be brought into force in the fourth quarter of this year, perhaps on 1 October.

At 1850 GMT a series of deputies are shown asking Shcherbakov questions on various aspects of the bill, including foreign investments. According to Shcherbakov, all state enterprises are to go over to a commercial operating system in 1992, probably 3-5 percent of enterprises will go bankrupt. Shcherbakov assures a deputy that agriculture will receive some kind of support from the state, but will not receive protection. Loss-incurring agricultural enterprises will also be subject to the bankruptcy law eventually.

At 1904 GMT the deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Industry and Energy speaks about the application of this law to industry and the implications of industrial enterprises going bankrupt, and the significance of the law in the transition to market relations.

At 1912 GMT the announcer says the bill on bankruptcy was adopted, and the session then moved on to the presentation of a bill on the rehabilitation of repressed people. Sebentsov, of the legality committee, took the floor and presented the bill, outlining its main provisions and proposed procedures.

At 1916 GMT two excerpts of the debate on the bill are presented, the first of Roy Medvedev favoring the adoption of the bill, and the second by an unidentified deputy.

At 1923 GMT the continuity announcer says the bill was passed at the first reading and notes that Boris Pugo, minister of internal affairs, delivered an address on the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. Concluding the report he notes that there will be a joint session of the chambers tomorrow. There is no voice recording.

Political & Social

Gorbachev, Yeltsin Interviewed on G-7 Agenda

LD0807200791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Interviews with President Mikhail Gorbachev; Boris Yeltsin, Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic (RSFSR) president; and Vitold Fokin, Ukraine's Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) prime minister; by unidentified correspondent in Novo-Ogarevo on 8 July; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, what is the main thing which unites you prior to your trip to London?

[Gorbachev] I will start with the last question—what unites us? We are united by our common responsibility, that which lies generally at the root of the very important. I would, without exaggeration, say the historical statements at the first meeting here in Novo-Ogarevo—responsibility for the fate of the fatherland, for us getting out of this very profound and grave crisis more quickly—we won't speak now of the causes—in order to stabilize both political life in the country and the economic situation, and for this to have consequences for the people with a view to improving their living conditions. Generally speaking, this is our concern.

This was manifested here today. I attach great importance to this process, because it is based on responsibility, accord, and the unification of efforts in order to tackle the historical tasks which have risen up before us in this phase of decisive transformations in renewing and reforming our society, and that which relates to the political process, political reform, including signing, elaborating and signing of the Union treaty, the new Union treaty, and that which relates to those important decisions which concern our choice in favor of a transition to the market.

All this was manifested here, and on this basis, great accord was achieved, a large degree of accord. I am traveling with a mandate and not only with my own convictions and ideas, and my own conclusions, but also with the common stance of all the participants in this process, with the stance of the Union republics. So this is what I have in mind to say in London, our agreed position.

There were problems in agreeing to the joint steps. You know, such enormous work has already been done, and an understanding has been achieved. Now it is necessary to advance decisively, uniting our efforts, along the path of profound democratic transformations, along the path of economic transformations, and transformations within the scope of the Union treaty. All this is something that ought to give us political stability, financial stability and a stable, a stable situation, from which we subsequently should... which will help us overcome the crisis.

[Correspondent] Is it your view that today many, well, practically all the main questions have been resolved prior to the trip and the discussion with the seven leading countries?

[Yeltsin] I would single out two factors. The first is that the country's president is going not only in his capacity as the president, not only as a representative of the center, but carrying the views of all the nine republics, their leaders. This is a view that has been agreed upon. This is of special importance for everyone and for our people too and this includes the countries of the seven. The second circumstance is: naturally, prior to the trip there is a great deal of speculation even about the trip to the effect that the country's president is going with a begging bowl to elicit big money there and so on and so forth, but this was not discussed at all.

Essentially the main position which was jointly elaborated today is that the president of a huge power, who is also representing the republics, is going in order to describe the position, to describe the processes that are taking place both in the republics and in the country as a whole, to set our some joint programs which may be implemented jointly, with the countries of the seven and our country and our people in mutual interests. This is essentially the main thing and it is of special importance...well, the transition, the time of the transition to the market economy, when, naturally, our people and all of us will find it very hard indeed. On this we reached agreement.

[Correspondent] Vitold Pavlovich, some words on the economic basis. Do you feel that these issues have been resolved, that this is a reliable basis in order for Mikhail Sergeyevich to travel to London?

[Fokin] Today, all those present at this meeting wished our president a good trip. We all understand full well that in isolation it is impossible to reform our society in earnest. That is, for there to be real, serious, I would say profound reforms, international cooperation is of course necessary; of course support is necessary, and of course investments and so on are necessary. This does not mean that we are planning to live in debt. We will rely on our own forces. We need a stimulus in order to start up the engine of the market. But we plan to work ourselves. We are not planning to leave only debts to our grandchildren. This, perhaps, is the essence of what took place here in Novo-Ogarevo today.

[Gorbachev] I would say that the discussion on economic issues took up one of the central...perhaps this was even the central problem of this discussion, because as regards political reform, the issue of a consensus—this is already clear, it has already been grasped by our whole society. We understand that it is impossible for this not to be. Without this there is confrontation and a dead-end road without prospects. And what was necessary today was to thoroughly work through the economic aspects of cooperation between the republics. Everyone...an understanding was manifested here that we are

capable of resolving all problems more successfully if we remember that we have developed as a single, powerful economic market in which to a large degree—whether we like it or not it is already a reality—the division of labor has taken place.

We are all very dependent. There is a tremendous degree of interaction. Destroying it under the guise of sovereignty, as it were—no, this is not what sovereignty consists of. Sovereignty consists of giving, allocating powers correctly, so that republics can exert influence on all the processes, take part in all the processes, in everything, on the macro-level, middle level and all levels alike. This, then, is what is needed and it is, after all, what is expected of us, and not the destruction of these natural ties which underpin our economy. Well, all this was broadly discussed today and understanding the fact that we ought to preserve this market, to give it a second wind, as it were—that is how I would put it, yes—interacting, making use of the initiative of the workforces, regions, people, the private initiative—this was discussed and there is understanding concerning it.

It is a decisive moment. The concerns are big. The decisions are difficult. There is no need to simplify anything. Well, the consensus is there and its transformation into specific political and practical steps is something else and you know we must do everything in a way so that people understand us. This is necessary so that they support it. Without this support nothing will happen. We are then simply doomed. But we must do all this and I am confident that people will hear us and support us at this decisive turning point in our fatherland's history.

'Vesti' Views Novo-Ogarevo 8 July Meeting

LD0807224691 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Video report by correspondent S. Dorenko—from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Excerpts] Before his trip to London, Gorbachev assembled Pavlov, Primakov, Yeltsin, Silayev and leaders of other republics in Novo-Ogarevo today, so that they should agree on what the soviet president should say to the rich foreigners from the G-7.

There are too many programs for saving the economy. The republics have created their own, not believing in the center's clumsy policy. [passage omitted] Agreement on a program was supposed to proceed fairly easily, despite the differences in positions. All the participants in this meeting are being pushed toward agreement by the threat of an economic crash. By the end of the day the desired result was reached. Gorbachev is traveling to London to propose cooperation with the approval of the republics.

Today's agreement is a good sign even without its connection with the meeting in London. Our leaders have learned to take each other into consideration. [video shows correspondent talking outdoors; Gorbachev, Pavlov and other leaders holding talks inside mansion, seated around a table; the leaders in a group outside the mansion, about to go indoors; the leaders strolling outside the building]

Gorbachev's Program for London Trip Approved

LD0807182191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A meeting between President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the leaders of nine republics took place in Novo-Ogarevo today. Questions connected with the USSR president's forthcoming trip to London to meet the leaders of the Seven were discussed. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev delivered a detailed report on this question. He set out a concept of the USSR's joining, in an organic manner, of the world economic community and of broad and mutually beneficial economic cooperation with it.

Taking part in the ensuing discussion were Yeltsin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic president; Karimov, president of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]; Fokin, prime minister of the Ukrainian SSR; Dementey, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussian SSR; Akayev, president of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan; Makhkamov, president of the Tajik SSR; Karamanov, prime minister of the Kazakh SSR; Kafarova, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijani Republic; Akhmedov, prime minister of the Turkmen SSR; and Pavlov, USSR prime minister.

Those who spoke approved the arguments advanced by the USSR president concerning the problems that will be discussed in London. As a result of the conference, which was conducted in a constructive and comradely spirit, a stance on the issue was agreed upon and adopted. More detailed information about the conference will be published.

Cabinet of Ministers Moves From Kremlin Offices

LD0907072691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1400 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] As the Novosti agency reports, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has moved out of the Moscow Kremlin to the offices on Pushkin street. Now it seems it is the time for the USSR Supreme Soviet. As everyone knows, the legislators may soon move to a multi-story building on Novyy Arbat. Until recently the CEMA headquarters used to reside there. Moscow observers are wondering for whom the space in the Kremlin is being cleared.

Oversight Committee Views Treaty, Economic Crime

PM0907085591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "In USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee"]

[Text] In connection with the USSR Supreme Soviet appeal, the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has examined the draft treaty on the Union of sovereign states.

The committee notes that the concept and draft of the new Union Treaty, like the progress of work on it, have been repeatedly discussed both in the republics' Supreme Soviets and in the USSR Supreme Soviet and have been examined at the fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Work on the draft was performed by the preparatory committee formed by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, which the Congress also instructed to determine the procedure for concluding the treaty. The elaboration of the draft was done by fully empowered representatives of the republics with the active participation of USSR people's deputies. The 23 April 1991 statement by the USSR president and the leaders of nine republics was a political document which accelerated the elaboration of the draft treaty.

Taking this into account, the committee does not see, in the organization of work on the draft treaty, any violations of the USSR Constitution or the constitutions of the republics or an encroachment on the powers of the supreme organs of the Union and the republics. As a whole the draft treaty deserves to be approved.

At the same time some legal aspects of the draft treaty are in need of further details, proposals for which the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has prepared for submission to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The committee examined the question of the compliance of point 19, article 12 of the USSR Law "on the Soviet Militia," which defines the powers of the militia in conducting measures to detect crimes in the economic sphere, with the USSR Constitution and with USSR legislation. The conclusion which was adopted admits that the militia have not been granted the right to enter living premises unimpeded if they are used by citizens for entrepreneurial activity. It has also been acknowledged that the militia's right to issue an official warning noting, within a procedure not established by law, the fact that officials and citizens have committed law violations does not comply with the USSR Constitution or the foundations of criminal and administrative legislation. Within the legislative initiative procedure a number of proposals have been submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet aimed at safeguarding the rights and legal interests of enterprises, institutions, organizations, and citizens in the sphere of economic activity.

Soyuz Official Criticizes Draft Union Treaty

OW0907051391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1030 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] We'll subject all articles of the draft Union treaty to analysis and relentlessly criticize the controversies they contain, declared Yuriy Blokhin, USSR people's deputy and cochairman of the group "Soyuz", addressing leading economic executives in the city of Tiraspol. Excerpts from his speech were printed by the newspaper "Sfatul Tseriy" published by Moldova's parliament.

I think, said Yuriy Blokhin, that this will be a treaty on dissolving the Soviet Union, and Gorbachev will do all he can to get the Novo-Ogarevo document signed. According to him, Novo-Ogarevo saw the drafting of a document designed to finally destroy the center. Our country, Yuriy Blokhin pointed out, will present something like the European Community.

Workers Urge Revision of Privatization Law

OW0807133691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1545 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A paliamentary group of around 40 worker parliamentarians circulated in the USSR Supreme Soviet a statement in connection with the recently passed privatisation law on Saturday.

The statement describes as unacceptable the provision of the law saying that a state owned enterprise may be privatised without the consent of a work collective, "which would inevitably lead to social tension in society".

Taking guidance from article 12 of the law "On the Status of the USSR People's Deputy", the worker deputies moved that the USSR Supreme Soviet reconsider the wording of article 9 of the privatisation law that gives a work collective priority in resolving the issues connected with title to its enterprise.

Deputies Group Urges Support for Reform Movement

OW0907075491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The scientific-industrial group of USSR people's deputies and the USSR Scientific-Industrial Union have issued an appeal to support the new Democratic Reform Movement with concrete actions.

In a statement given to "INTERFAX" the deputies and leaders of a number of unions, associations, enterprises and organizations stress the importance of political stability for pushing ahead the economic reform. In their opinion, stability could be reached through unification of people with good will and common sense on the ample centrist basis.

The statement emphasizes that transition to a market economy is the only way of pulling the country out of the crisis. However, now the economy is becoming more and more a hostage of political confrontation between different extremist forces. The situation is aggravated by

"lack of decisive and coordinated actions by democratic forces, as well as resistance of those unwilling to understand that reforms are historically inevitable."

The complete text of the statement will be published in IF's [INTERFAX] edition of "Nation and Society" on July 12.

Democratic Platform Official on Reforms

AU0907080891 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 5 Jul 91 p 6

[Interview with Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy by Laszlo Lengyel in Moscow, in July 1991: "The Regime Is Ready For Change"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Text] Two years ago, Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy was rector of the party college in Moscow. The college became a headquarters for the reform wing of the CPSU, and Shostakovskiy himself became one of the leading members of the Democratic Platform. A year ago, during the division of the CPSU into two wings—a democratic wing and a bolshevik-type wing—Shostakovskiy tried to divide party property. This proved to be impossible, and Shostakovskiy's own viewpoints developed, so he left the party and founded the Russian Republican Party, which he co-chairs with Vladimir Lisenko. Prior to the congress of the Russian Republican Party last weekend, Shostakovskiy met with Eduard Shevardnadze and spoke to him about the possibility of joining his movement. We spoke to Shostakovskiy about the aims and political chances of this new movement.

[Lengyel] Could the new movement spearheaded by Shevardnadze and Yakovlev become a determining political force that influences the fate of the country, a rival to the CPSU?

[Shostakovskiy] What real political forces are there in the country at the moment? There is the miners' movement, and there are a few charismatic personalities who have attracted some political forces around them—these forces could influence developments. The supreme soviets of some of the republics also represent true political forces. The Novo-Ogarjevo declaration had a great effect because it was a real move forward.

The CPSU and the Russian Communist Party have never been true political parties. The basic organizations are not even doing any symbolic work, millions of members are not paying their fees or are failing to pass them on. The apparatus has been trying to climb out of the trench for a long time, but it does not manage more than a few SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA articles. They clearly lost the Russian elections.

Yet they cannot be written off completely because they have grown like Siamese twins with the generals and the leadership of the KGB. Thus, they are a horrible force, because they cannot make any constructive moves. They have the potential of dread—they have strength, but they have no program or intellectual content. They are not even being helped by the intellectual forces among their ranks.

[Lengyel] That is precisely why a real rival force is needed to oppose the CPSU. Is that not what Shevardnadze and his followers recognized?

[Shostakovskiy] The parties that have emerged so far are weak. They have little money, their organizational structure is weak, they have no press organ or means of influencing the masses. People do not like parties, they want to stay away from any kind of party. The hope and confidence that appeared after the 28th Congress have disappeared. The only thing that remained was Boris Yeltsin and the progressive wing of the Russian Supreme Soviet. This new emerging party has to face up to the same difficulties as the ones encountered by the parties that already exist.

[Lengyel] If I have understood correctly, the aim of the new party is precisely to unite existing democratic parties and to increase its influence on the masses.

[Shostakovskiy] A democratic mass party or movement cannot work successfully just like that, in general. It can only work if it has a concrete goal. For example, a chairman has to be elected. In Dagestan, I noticed that the Islamic forces, the Orthodox clergy, and the democratic parties were able to unite with Yeltsin's support.

[Lengyel] Could the renewal of the Union and economic reform be such goals?

[Shostakovskiy] In today's Soviet society, interests are not differentiated, everything is averaged out and brought down to a common denominator. At the moment, our interest is that something should be put on the shelves of the shop next-door. However, if there is a true market economy, then there will be different, striking interests, there will be real classes, and consequently, parties will have a raison d'etre.

[Lengyel] Is that not the real aim of the new movement?

[Shostakovskiy] One cannot unite the masses by saying "yes to reforms." That is a utopian thought. It will not make an organized, disciplined, and combat ready party.

[Lengyel] That does not even seem to be a goal yet.

[Shostakovskiy] Shevardnadze and his followers want to create a movement that could eventually become a party. Elements in Democratic Russia give a frosty reception to the idea of a movement. They have already been a movement, and they have realized that a party is needed. Travkin and his associates are announcing the creation of a United Democratic Party. The best option would be a rotating two-party system, a classic bipartite system.

[Lengyel] You are thinking of Travkin's party versus Shevardnadze's party, not the CPSU versus a democratic party?

[Shostakovskiy] Precisely. Unless there is violence, the CPSU will fall out. However, there will be no bipartite system. I am afraid that a new monopoly will develop, even though it will not be bolshevik. There will be strict discipline, the brutal repression of dissent, and tight organizational rules. This would destroy the fragile new party structure.

[Lengyel] Is there really no clear common goal?

[Shostakovskiy] The election of a Soviet president could be such a goal. Some people are even saying that this is why Gorbachev needs a new movement—this theory is not to be excluded. However, I believe in the sincerity of Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Popov, and Sobchak. In any case, everything does not depend on the person who is president.

[Lengyel] Could it be that Gorbachev needs the new movement to progress?

[Shostakovskiy] If so, then he made a big mistake last year. Last year, the possibility of a division in the party was not made use of. If the same people had supported the Democratic Platform at that time, Gorbachev's hands would be free today. Of course, it is true to say that we overestimated our chances last year. Opinion polls made it look as though a million-strong party could be created within a few weeks. Emotional support is one thing, and determined action is another. Most of those who left the party did not join anything, they grew tired and lost interest.

[Lengyel] You [the Russian Republican Party] will still be joining the movement, if my information is correct.

[Shostakovskiy] Yes, we will support it, but always depending on the concrete situation and the relevant measure. Our congress did not support the idea of our completely blending into the new movement. Our local branches argued that whenever necessary, we have always cooperated perfectly well with all democratic forces in the past.

[Lengyel] Well, let us speak frankly: Could the new movement be the basis for a change of regime?

[Shostakovskiy] That is precisely what they are not saying in clear terms. Everything is hazy, the aims are not clear. They speak about general human values and humane goals, and they say that the conservatives have to be defeated, that we need a reliable shield for democratic transformation. But what transformation? How far will they go?

[Lengyel] You do not think that this has been decided yet?

[Shostakovskiy] We are marked by a certain powerlessness and the most difficult thing is to decide. The CPSU is still very arrogant, it acts as though it was still directing events. It is also characterized by self-delusion. This is illustrated by the fact that they say: People do not understand us, and if we declare that a change of regime is needed, they will cling to socialism. Yet people have known for a long time that the regime needs to be changed. Even the party membership knows that.

It has to be said out loud. Perhaps it will even be said out loud in September—they might be ready for it by then. I have traveled down this road, I know how difficult it is, I know how much doubt and torment it entails.

[Lengyel] So is this the beginning of the end or the end of the beginning? Is it the end of socialism, or the beginning of a change of regime?

[Shostakovskiy] We cannot know yet, it is not yet clear. There are several socialists among the nine people who signed the appeal—the Plekhanovite, Menshevik type of socialist. However, they might mature by autumn. By then, we will know the fate of the Union, of our economy, of Gorbachev, of the CPSU, of the country, and of the empire.

Seleznev Commentary Views New Reform Movement

PM0807112591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Gennadiy Seleznev, member of the CPSU Central Committee: "Wait and See"]

[Text] The call for the creation of a new "For the Unification of the Forces of Democracy and Reform" movement has been met with joy by some people and with alarm by others.

Attentively reading the appeal from the "nine" initiators, I must admit that I am prepared to subscribe to the many theses and correct words. Except that I reject categorical and unbending conclusions along the lines of: "Either the country will go further down the path of fundamental transformations, the liberation of society, and the provision of real freedom, and take real steps toward well-being and prosperity.

"Or there will be a revolt by reactionary forces blinded by hatred of freedom and progress, and by the prospect of losing their privileges. There will be a new dictatorship, a restoration of the old order, fear, and violence. Poverty will hold sway once again. A national tragedy would be inevitable."

If everything were that simple there would be no need to set up any movements. Most of the people have long since rejected the second "option," but it is not withering away and, unfortunately, is often cultivated even by those who have proclaimed the path of "fundamental transformations, the liberation of society, and the provision of real freedom..." I am referring to the actions of the current Georgian, Lithuanian, and Moldavian leaderships, where nationalism and the status of one nation as a chosen people are elevated to the level of state policy. Dissidence is exterminated and freedom of speech is seen merely as the freedom to praise the steps taken by these republics' leaders. And are there any

Russian cities and oblasts which have chosen the path of fundamental transformations and found themselves in a famine worse than during the war? As for the threat of dictatorship in the country, following E. Shevardnadze's famous statements on the subject, it seems to me that neither politics, astrology, nor the author of the statement himself have been able to find even the hint of a uniform or some other signs of the forces of dictatorship.

So that the theses and antitheses being put about are more akin to the echo of rallies and the whipping up of feelings.

I have no doubt that many of us would like to believe in the sincerity of the document and of the principles declared by its initiators:

spiritual, economic, and political freedom of the individual, and their social and economic protection;

a parliamentary republic, legality, and law and order;

the fundamental transformation of the economic system, competition, and real opportunity. The transformation of the country's citizens into property owners and recipients of the fruits of their labor;

national cooperation and the preservation of the historic core of our state as a union of free and sovereign peoples;

the condemnation and rejection of all forms of national extremism, chauvinism, and racism;

common sense and constructive cooperation between all responsible citizens who oppose chaos and anarchy;

equal and earnest cooperation in foreign policy and foreign economic affairs, and the peaceful development of civilization.

You will agree, readers, that it is all reasonable and sensible, in line with the parliamentary policy pursued by the country's Supreme Soviet.

So why then does one have nagging doubts about the sincerity of the "nine," their ability to implement these principles, and their adherence to them?

Probably because most members of the "nine" are well acquainted with the 28th CPSU Congress Program Statement "Toward Humane and Democratic Socialism," where the document—perhaps not in the same words, but in the entire context—says exactly what the movement initiators are saying. Some of the movement's initiators were directly involved with drafting the Program Statement, but why did they do so little to implement it if they are again returning to their former postulates?

I am not even talking about the new draft party program, which was extensively discussed the other day and will be submitted for examination by the next CPSU Central Committee plenum. I have no doubt that there are people among the members of the "nine" who are very familiar with the text of the draft. And if the organizers of the all-Union "For the Unification of the Forces of Democracy and Reform" movement have included the ideas of the future CPSU program in the content of their own activity, why is our party considered conservative and incapable of reform from within? This means that this is not the case. Is it possible that the supporters of the new movement are prepared to replenish the ranks of the CPSU and rally around its new program?

As for the euphoria shown by certain citizens about the fact that the CPSU will have a powerful opponent in the shape of the new movement, quite frankly I do not understand them: The statement makes no mention of any confrontation. Although we are no longer so naive, and we have quite recent experience of the creation and subsequent evolution of people's fronts, "Sajudis," "Birlik," [name as transliterated] and other movements which, when they were founded, called themselves supporters of perestroyka.

They very soon forgot about perestroyka, common sense, and the rule-of-law state. Does the new movement threaten to do likewise? I do not know—let's wait and see, as they say. That is why I am in no hurry to appeal to my party comrades to "hitch up their pants and run" to the "nine."

Youth Paper Reaction to 'Democratic Movement'

PM0807152191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 91 p 1

[Feature comprising commentary by I. Sichka on announcement of setting up of "Movement for Democratic Reform": "Party Adjourned. Until the Fall," and accompanied by roundup attributed to A. Podkopalov and comprising interview with Democratic Party of Russia's N. Travkin, report on 2 July news conference at Moscow City Soviet given by initiators of "Movement for Democratic Reform," and report on 2 July announcement by USSR presidential press secretary V. Ignatenko]

[Text] The idea of creating a fairly powerful and numerically large party of a democratic tendency capable of competing against the CPSU has not only blossomed but has already started to fade in some places. The first real opportunity to move on from good intentions to the practical work of organizing such a party arose last year with the emergence of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU." However, instead of splitting the CPSU, the "Democratic Platform" itself was split.

This spring saw the beginning of a second attempt to create a democratic "superparty." The founding fathers' names flashed before our eyes: A. Yakovlev, E. Shevardnadze, G. Popov, A. Sobchak, A. Volskiy...

Information on the mechanism of the creation of the new party has also filtered out. The action group rejected attempts to create a party on the base of the CPSU, or, more accurately, its democratic wing, which at present is not particularly visible. It was proposed that the existing

structures of the Democratic Party of Russia (Travkin's party) be used as a basis, being the most organized in their makeup in comparison with the other new parties of a democratic orientation. Preliminary agreement was reached with Travkin on this matter. It was also proposed that the leaders of the Russian republicans and social democrats be encouraged to form a coalition. Thus the new united democratic party immediately acquired a ramified structure, and the mass influx of new members was evidently to guarantee a sufficient respectability for the founders.

Although this time the aim of bringing about a split in the CPSU was not set directly, no doubt the hidden expectation existed that the names of Yakovlev, Shevardnadze, and Volskiy would draw the remainder of the reform-minded members out of the CPSU.

It must be admitted that the plan is very well structured and logical. However, in our country scarcely anything happens according to the laws of logic, and "normal heroes always go the roundabout way." The appeal "For the Unification of the Forces of Democracy and Reform," signed by A. Volskiy, A. Yakovlev, G. Popov, E. Shevardnadze, A. Sobchak, S. Shatalin, I. Silayev, N. Petrakov, and A. Rutskoy appeared yesterday. It is apparent from it that the birth of a new party has not taken place. And the rather wish-washy principles of the appeal, on the one hand, and the motley crew of nine "signers" on the other makes you think that "this is neither one thing nor the other."

So what happened? At the last moment Nikolay Travkin refused to join the appeal and place his party at the disposal of the "nine." No accord was reached with the leaders of the social democrats and the republicans, either. On the other hand the name of Colonel Rutskoy, who heads the movement "Communists for Democracy" in Russia, appeared quite unexpectedly among the founders. This fact, and also the clear reluctance of some of the founders to break with the CPSU led Travkin to suspect that in fact this is just the latest attempt to reform the CPSU, and he definitely does not want to participate in that. As for the republican and social democratic leaders, they did not deem it possible to play "in the dark," becoming part of a new party without having a clear program of its actions.

But the idea started to capture the masses, which caused some rumblings among the rank-and-file social democrats and republicans. The supporters of unification are threatening to split the already none-too-monolithic ranks of the Social Democratic Party of Russia and the Republican Party of Russia. Last year's story involving the "Democratic Platform" may be repeated, when, by "splitting" the CPSU, the splittists split themselves. Evidently this threat encouraged the leaders of all three parties of the as yet nonexistent coalition to start talks on unification. But without the "nine."

Thus, so far we only have a declaration of intent to create a broad nationwide movement for democratic reforms. The issue of whether this will be a party or whether the whole thing will remain within the framework of a movement of the "Democratic Russia" type has been postponed until the consitutent conference scheduled for the fall.

Two circumstances introduce a fair amount of skepticism into the event that has taken place. First of all, the sufficiently large and badly organized "Democratic Russia" movement already exists. Is it worth kicking up a new fuss and filling people's heads with confusion? In the final analysis it is easier to transform "Democratic Russia" from a republican to an all-union movement, particularly since the programmatic aims are by and large one and the same. Second, it seems to me that our society has already passed the peak of the "movements" period when people united in opposition to something rather than in support of something. Today we can observe a trend toward the delimitation of interests, and appeals of a general democratic nature are scarcely capable of creating even slightly reliable social structures.

And, finally, the "maneuvers" being carried out by certain founding fathers of the new movement do not inspire particular confidence. One moment they are declaring their readiness to leave the CPSU and create an "alternative party," the next minute they are retracting their declarations and starting to advocate a broad movement in which a place is also to be found for the "reformist wing of the CPSU. Maybe these are suitable tactics for palace intrigues, but they are scarcely capable of winning the trust of the broad masses. [Sichka ends]

What N. Travkin [Democratic Party of Russia] Thinks About This

[Podkopalov] Nikolay Ilich, why did you not sign the appeal or join the organizing committee of the "Movement for Democratic Reform"?

[Travkin] First of all, while this whole business was in preparation there was talk of creating a united democratic party, not a movement. Second, there was preliminary agreement on the withdrawal from the CPSU of the initiators of this process. Yet now there is not a word of this. Not only that, it has been declared that you can be in this "Movement" without leaving the CPSU. But that means a reformed CPSU, and not a democratic movement at all. And particularly not a party. I don't play those games.

[Podkopalov] And how are the republicans and the social democrats responding to the idea of creating a united democratic party?

[Travkin] At regional and local level, there is complete agreement. But the leadership of the republican party is opposed to this and the leaders of the social democrats are divided—some support this idea, others don't...

What The Authors Of The Appeal Think About This

A news conference was held yesterday at Moscow City Soviet by the initiators of the "Movement for Democratic Reform"—A. Volskiy, G. Popov, E. Shevardnadze, A. Sobchak, and N. Petrakov.

The news conference participants stressed that the disillusionment of certain observers and supporters of democracy with the fact that a movement rather than a party has been formed is premature. It will be decided conclusively at the constituent conference in September whether united democracy will be represented by a party or a movement. Furthermore, the initiators themselves, notably E. Shevardnadze, G. Popov, and A. Sobchak, support the idea of a party. The postponement of a decision on this issue is due to the large volume of preparatory work and the need to hold further consultations with the currently existing democratic parties and movements. The members of the organizing committee intend to go out to various regions in the near future to carry out organizational work.

It was noted that the proposed democratic association will operate on a Union scale and will also be open to the democratic forces of the republics that are not participating in the Novo-Ogarevo process.

As far the possible participation in the movement of members of the CPSU is concerned, Shevardnadze said the following: While we are talking about a movement, anyone can participate in it, regardless of their party membership. The main criterion is support for democratic reforms. If the movement is transformed into a party in September, the attitude toward membership will be stricter. Incidentally, Shevardnadze himself has promised to finally determine his position as regards his staying in the CPSU.

Sobchak noted that the "Movement" does not intend to distance itself from rank-and-file Communists. At a time when leaders at various levels in the CPSU are competing against one another in terms of their reactionary views, a significant proportion of Communists, who are aware of the need for reform, are prepared to support the democratic movement. And they must not be deprived of this opportunity.

What The USSR President Thinks About This

Yesterday V. Ignatenko, the USSR president's press secretary, informed journalists of M.S. Gorbachev's opinion.

"...It is apparent from the initiators' appeal that the 'Movement' is not of a confrontational nature. On the contrary, it invites all forces, all parties, all factions, all movements—all who sincerely support the ideals of perestroyka and the success of our cause in the country. If we interpret the organization of the 'Movement' thus, then this is a positive factor."

The creation of such a movement came as no surprise to M.S. Gorbachev, the presidential aide said, since its initiators had made their intentions widely enough known. However, the president could not act as consultant or advisor in this matter.

Commentary Identifies Three 'Currents' in CPSU

PM0807163991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Article by Nikolay Andreyev under "Political Diary" rubric: "Who Will Join the Party? 'Movement for Democratic Reforms': Aims Clear, Tasks Defined. Now Only Time Will Tell"]

[Text] A long-awaited event has taken place the possibility of which had been repeatedly denied and used to frighten people. On 1 July it nonetheless became reality. I am referring to the statement by a group of the country's well-known politicians who have called for the unification of democratic movements and parties. The initiators include A. Volskiy, A. Yakovlev, G. Popov, E. Shevardnadze, A. Sobchak, S. Shatalin, I. Silayev, N. Petrakov, and A. Rutskoy. In the document, which can be viewed as a prototype program, they proclaim the principles: man's spiritual, economic, and political freedom; his social and economic protection; a parliamentary system; a radical transformation of the economic system; preservation of our state; promotion of the peaceful development of civilization. The initiators have called for the convening of a constituent conference for the unification of democratic forces and, as the ultimate aim, the establishment of a party.

This event must, unquestionably, be viewed against the backdrop of the processes which are currently taking place in the CPSU. Its crisis is obvious. Despite the fact that it seemed that after the 28th congress, which was under way exactly a year ago, the situation in the party had stabilized. A programmatic statement "Toward humane, democratic socialism" had been adopted in which an attempt was made to find a common denominator for the relatively motley views of CPSU members on current events and the direction to be followed by Communists in the future. However, subsequent events demonstrated that it will not be possible to maintain unity within the party. And what is more, not just speaking hypothetically but in entirely specific terms: It is enough to read the communist press to arrive at this conclusion, despite the numerous vigorous denials which feature on its pages that there are any differences inside the CPSU. V. Lipitskiy, member of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, for example, came in for sharp criticism on the pages of PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA as soon as he published his relatively reserved reflections in IZVESTIYA on the existence within the party of various currents, sometimes espousing mutually exclusive philosophies, which, in the opinion of the author, will almost inevitably lead to a split in the party. GLASNOST, the CPSU Central Committee weekly, wrote in connection with the IZVESTIYA article: "V. Lipitskiy, having fallen under the spell of 'democratic'

(note the very characteristic quotation marks—N.A.) ideologies, views the party as an organism which is fundamentally incapable of development. Meanwhile the almost century-long history of the CPSU testifies to the contrary." However, it is precisely the greater part of the CPSU's history which confirms that "the party of a new type" is incapable of self-reformation. And furthermore, Lipitskiy is discussing something quite different—dissatisfaction with the situation within the party. The attempts to rally the party undertaken in the programmatic document of the 28th CPSU Congress by means of compromise formulations have ultimately resulted in an even greater differentiation of positions. And it could not have been otherwise while people like, for example, Nina Andreyeva, a vehement opponent of democratism, and Aleksandr Rutskoy, leader of the "Communists for Democracy" deputies' group, belong to the same party.

Today many hopes are pinned on the new CPSU Program. But will it not share the same fate as the programmatic statement "Toward a humane, democratic socialism," in which an attempt was made to unite what is incompatible, resulting in an even greater polarization.

Incidentally, it cannot be ruled out that the new CPSU Program will provide an opportunity to answer the question: Who is a Communist and who is not. M. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, put it quite bluntly: The new program will be the touchstone which will make it possible to verify who is with us and who is against us. However, the test of who is "ours or not ours" is not going to be a simple task, either. Because each of the currents regards itself alone as the true Communists, viewing all others as apostates. Recently I saw pickets in front of the familiar building on Staraya Ploshchad [CPSU Central Committee headquarters] sporting a poster reading: "Down with the anticommunists in the CPSU Central Committee!" What they meant by anticommunists were M. Gorbachev, A. Yakovlev, and E. Shevardnadze. I later met the pickets among the participants in the second congress of the Communist initiative movement, which has rallied under its banner inveterate fundamentalists of the communist ideology. Their mood is highly aggressive and impatient. And they seriously hope that by convening an extraordinary 29th CPSU Congress they will be able to deprive all apostates of their party cards, and first and foremost Gorbachev and Yakovlev.

Nor is all well in the Russian Communist Party. Recently, at a meeting of CPSU obkom secretaries from Siberia, a statement was signed which demanded the resignation of [RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary] I. Polozkov. The reason—there is a need today for new leaders possessing intellectual courage, wisdom, and a commonsense approach to current events.

Significant words rang out at the April Plenum: It is not Communists who are sitting in the hall but representatives of three or four parties. A rough breakdown would be as follows. In the CPSU there are representatives of the party of bureaucratic, administrative socialism. They are convinced that "The CPSU is a huge obstacle in the path of those who seek to transform our society into a capitalist society"—I am citing a member of the Politburo—"or as they call it, return society to the bosom of world civilization, but essentially to consign it to the rear of historical development." Then there is the party of "We cannot waive our principles," behind which the profile of the generalissimo is clearly discernible. Its prominent representative, A. Sergeyev, believes: "For those who occupy the positions of defense of the cornerstone tenets of Marxism-Leninism and the constant creative development of this teaching on a genuinely scientific basis...for those members of the CPSU there is no, nor can there be, any cause for a split." However, anyone who does not agree with Sergeyev is not worthy of the title of Communist. Here the unsuccessful candidate for the post of vice president poses the following task: "We see our function today above all as exerting pressure on the leadership of the CPSU and the Russian Communist Party to forestall their transformation into a social democratic party..."

And, finally, there is the third current with the social democratic orientation. As a matter of fact, its representatives issued the appeal "For the unification of the forces of democracy and reforms." Naturally, hard-line Marxists are bound to declare them to be anticommunists. Irrespective of its name, the new party will claim the right to take over from the CPSU. And, as Yu. Prokofyev rightly suspects, "lay claim to part of its property." However, the main point nonetheless lies elsewhere—for many members of the CPSU, even if they are by no means satisfied with the political line of its current leadership, it is morally difficult to give up their party card. Here they are given an opportunity to consider themselves Communists and at the same time to part company with the orthodox militants ready to defend cornerstones to their last breath. As G. Shakhnazarov, the president's assistant, noted, the communist idea cannot serve as the banner of practical policy, and consequently cannot be the concrete objective of a party which is seeking power.

How will events develop further? The July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum will be of fundamental importance. The plenum debate will reveal the alignment of forces in the party. A partywide debate is also inevitable, although the people, and that includes the party membership, are tired of endless discussions. A great deal will depend on the stand of the general secretary. According to B. Ignatenko, head of the USSR president's press service, Gorbachev's first reaction was that if the "movement" is going to contribute to consolidation then it is possible to welcome it.

And as for the initiators of the constituent conference for the unfication of democratic movements and parties, it is possible to say the following: Everything will hinge on their organizational abilities. The principles they have proclaimed in their statement are noble, but at the same time they are generally known and have been declared

more than once. We have heard and read similar words many times before. So what will their concrete policy be? At present society puts more trust in personalities than in programs and appeals. The initiators of the "movement" are people who are well known and popular. Who will follow their lead?

Official on Need for Third Political Force

OW0807095791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Chairman of the executive committee of the Soviet Science and Industry Union Aleksandr Vladislavlev has told the IF [INTERFAX] correspondent that the attempt to set up a Movement for Democratic Reforms backed, among others, by the Union's President Arcadiy Volski is approved by the leaders of Soviet economy and non- government economic structures. (The Union includes managers of state industries and entrepreneurs' associations from all the republics - IF). At the same time A. Vladislavlev points out that the authors of the declaration act on their own initiative and in their own name. He thinks that shows their resonsibility for the country's future.

Restructuring, went on Vladislavlev, is up against two forces: The orthodox, dogmatic, fundamentalist leaers of the Communist Party, on the one hand, and the extremist, intolerant, radical part of the democratic movement.

That placed the leader of restructuring Mikhail Gorbachev into a difficult position, explains Vladislavlev. He has no support of any solid mas political force capable to defend reforms from extremist and dogmatic attacks. His hopes for a democratic transformation of the whole Communist Party have proved futile, the nomenclature is blocking such changes and is openly trying to back on the decisions of the 28th Congress. The democratic movement, on its part, has compromized itself with many hasty decisions and unrealistic goals.

All that—stressed the leader of Science and Industry Union—calls for a third force which could rally society round simple, clear and vital slogans: free labour, adequate rewards, guaranteed rights and freedoms, protection of property, supremacy and reliability of law, and a genuinely democratic system.

Interested in such a third force are, most of all, the industrialists and entrepreneurs—people who create the material wealth, many of whom are members of the Science and Industry Union. "Our Union is not a political organisation, though. Its members are free to choose their attitude towards the Movement for Democratic Reforms", concluded Vladislavlev.

Nationalities Commission Debates Kurd Problems

PM0907100191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by G. Shipitko: "Refugees in Their Own Country"]

[Text] The commission on nationalities policy and interethnic relations has heard a report on the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet special commission on the problems of the Kurds. The reason for addressing the problem of the nearly 200,000-strong people lies in the failure to resolve the consequences of the deportation of dozens of peoples from the Transcaucasus during the war.

This is the deputies' latest attempt to find ways of resolving the problem. Before that there were Karabakh, Fergana, the Baltic republics, and the Transcaucasus. The hotbeds of interethnic conflicts have not been extinguished and our entire society can feel their consequences. About 1 million refugees are wandering around today in search of shelter and the means to exist.

The Kurds are among those who today have become outcasts in our society. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees adopted in the fifties through the seventies did not give them a real right to return to their homes. Nor indeed did they give that right to the Turks, Khemshin, or Assyrians.

The precarious social balance in the places of their present residence was finally disrupted by the interethnic conflicts in Uzbekistan and Kirghizia. Over 8,000 Kurds left for Russia and Azerbaijan. The conditions in which they find themselves now can scarcely be compared even with the common plight of us all. Deprived of work, registration, and housing, they are in need even of the most essential items—of food. The ration system introduced by the local organs of power for the provision of food has essentially faced the people with a choice—either striving themselves for their rights or disappearing with their national customs, traditions, and language.

The report delivered by V. Sobolev, the commission's chairman, still instilled hope that the problem can be resolved. The leadership of Azerbaijan is prepared to grant all Kurds broad cultural autonomy and the opportunity for the full resurrection of their language and the creation of schools, press organs, and radio and television programs. But in the opinion of the republic's government it would be premature to speak of creating a statehood today. It is this circumstance which is the topic of today's differences with the leaders of the all-union "Yakbun" Kurdish association, which is insisting on the restoration of the Kurdish national okrug in Azerbaijan.

It is clear that the position of the sovereign republic must be considered. Especially as armed clashes are taking place between Azerbaijanis and Armenians in the region

which until 1931 was the Kurdistan okrug. And making them hostages of an interethnic conflict means dooming people to new sufferings.

Yet, the deputies noted, swift and vigorous measures are needed right now making it possible to create at least a minimum of social conditions for the refugees. And not only for the Kurds. In Krasnodar Kray today there are about 40,000 refugees—Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Turks, and Assyrians. And this problem requires comprehensive solution. For many months now deep within the Cabinet of Ministers there has been a draft law on forced migrants, which should be submitted for examination by the country's Supreme Soviet. A similar draft is being elaborated in Russia. In any case the future treaty between the republics should also provide for the legal protection of people who have left their homes because of interethnic conflicts. Now, came the assurance from the commission's chairman, V. Sobolev, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Government is completing the preparation of a document which will make it possible to improve the social position of all refugees in Krasnodar Kray.

So far in its decision the commission has asked all republic leaders to examine questions of improving the social position and provision of daily amenities for the Kurds and of satisfying their national culture needs. But, L. Gorshkov, deputy chairman of the commission for nationalities policy and interethnic relations, noted, legal acts are needed which must be recognized by all republics. And that is the main task both of the commission and of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

MVD On Latest Provisions of Emigration Law

91UN1916B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 91 Union Edition p 7

[Report by I. Andreyev: "From Knowledgeable Sources—Must Departure From the USSR Be Made Prior to 1 July?"]

[Text] **As IZVESTIYA has already reported (No. 123, 1991), beginning 1 July of this year the discriminatory Ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 17 February 1967 loses its validity. The ukase deprives of Soviet citizenship those of our countrymen who have obtained permission to resettle in Israel. This humane action, which puts an end to almost a quarter century of injustice, has evoked panic among thousands and thousands of people who are leaving the country. Those unable to leave prior to 1 July have been instructed to reapply to organs of the VIR [Visas, Permits, and Passports Department] so as to obtain a Soviet foreign travel passport.**

In our commentary "Soviet Citizenship Within a Short Time?" (No. 127), which appeared prior to publication of the USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution of 20 May 1991, one of whose points repeals the long- standing ukase, we focused the attention of legislators on the "1 July problem." Emigrants having no other information except what appeared in IZVESTIYA, rushed out to procure railway and air tickets for May and June. Alas, they had appealed in vain to organs of the Visas, Permits, and Passports Department for trustworthy information. And they attacked our publication, which itself tried unsuccessfully to obtain an authoritative explanation...

An explanation was provided on 19 June at a USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] briefing where R. Kuznetsov, chief of the MVD Visas, Permits, and Passports Department, clarified matters somewhat with respect to this problem which appeared out of the blue, so to speak.

Noting that since 1967, exit from the USSR for permanent residence abroad has increased more than 65-fold, Rudolf Alekseyevich stressed that all previously existing restrictions have been repealed. Now one may move to any country upon any relative's invitation, not just close relatives. Or by permission of foreign diplomatic or consular representatives in the USSR for entry to the receiving country.

In 1988-1989, 344,000 individuals left our country; in 1990, 453,400 Soviet citizens received permission for exit. During the current year, emigration has stabilized—the number of citizens applying to Visas, Permits, and Passports Department organs over the five-month period is 8.9 percent less than over the same period last year.

Regarding the "1 July problem," the Visas, Permits, and Passports Department chief states that the USSR MVD has dispatched instructions to the localities providing for:

—a special-priority, simplified redrafting of visas previously issued to individuals emigrating to Israel into general citizens' foreign travel passports;

—the use of Israeli entry visas obtained previously by citizens, and their attachment to issued foreign travel passports;

—impermissibility of disrupting the departure of citizens abroad who have tickets of passage, or of their having to redraft ticketing through the fault of Visas, Permits, and Passports Department organs due to late issue of new foreign travel documents;

—the return to citizens departing after 1 July of this year by finance organs of state duty previously paid in the amount of 500 rubles for withdrawal of USSR citizenship;

—informing citizens in Visas, Permits, and Passports Department section offices and in the mass media concerning the change in procedure for departing the country for permanent residence abroad.

Relative of Last Czar To Be Canonized

OW0907051591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1030 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As "Uralinform" correspondent was told at the Sverdlovsk Diocese, the Russian Orthodox Church is going to canonize Grand Duchess Elizaveta Fiodorovna, a member of the family of the last Russian Czar. In this connection a memorial service will be held on July 18 on the bottom of the mine in the city of Alapayevsk in Sverdlovsk region where in 1918 the grand duchess was killed.

The canonization of Elizaveta Fiodorovna will be the first step on the road toward canonizing the slain members of the Czar's family by the Moscow Diocese.

On July 16 the Archbishop of Sverdlovsk and Kurgan will hold a memorial service for the innocent family of the Czar at the place where they were shot in Ipatiev's house in Sverdlovsk.

TASS Reviews 9 July Press

LD0907111391 Moscow TASS in English 0543 GMT 9 Jul 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS—PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA open their front pages today with reports about talks between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez in the Kremlin on Monday.

Gonzalez stressed Spain's solidarity with the Soviet Union and its interest in the success of perestroika.

PRAVDA carries the two leaders' speeches at a dinner in Gonzalez's honour.

The two newspapers comment on a meeting between Gorbachev and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl near Kiev on July 5. PRAVDA stressed the importance of the talks for Soviet-German relations. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA covers a joint press conference of Gorbachev and Kohl held after their talks.

Newspapers publish extracts from a resolution by the Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat to step up the struggle against economic crimes.

"The movement towards civilised market relations requires resolute measures to strengthen law and order in compliance with the current constitutional norms," the resolution says.

It calls for steps to overcome difficulties in the sphere of production and to remove the causes of economic crimes.

[TASS English indicates "more," but FBIS has received nothing further]

Economic

Deficit Could Lead To 'Financial Catastrophe'

LD0807212691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2052 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] Viktor Gubarev, USSR people's deputy and deputy chairman of the Commission for Budget and Planning of the Union parliament, has said that by the end of this year the budget deficit will have reached 300 billion rubles and this could lead the country to a financial catastrophe. According to his data, in the first quarter the deficit exceeded tolerable norms by four times. Viktor Gubarev believes that a catastrophe can be avoided if the union budget is endorsed only after it is approved by all repubics.

Meanwhile the USSR Cabinet of ministers is not submitting an extraordinary budget to the parliament for discussion owing to the difficulties in agreeing the anti-crisis program and also the position of Russia, which defends a system of taxation of its own.

Deadline for Exchange of Banknotes Expires

LD0407173291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1050 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jul (TASS)—USSR Gosbank announces that the exchange of money in denominations of 50 and 100 rubles of the 1961 design, carried out under the USSR president's decree of 22 January 1991, has been completed in view of the expiry of the fixed deadline, and the examination of citizens's applications by all bodies authorized to do so has ceased.

The right to exchange banknotes belonging to them is retained only by citizens who were on prolonged foreign assignment during the period of exchange. These citizens must, within a period of three days after their return from assignment, present their applications for exchange of the banknotes of 50 and 100 rubles value, 1961 design, in their possession, for examination by the commissions of the enterprises (organizations) which sent them on assignment. These commissions are entitled to permit exchange within the limits of the average monthly earnings, but not exceeding 1,000 rubles, and permits to exchange more than the said amount at the representation of the commissions of the enterprises (organizations) are issued by the oblast (kray), republican (without oblast division) commissions for exchange of money as per the procedure defined by resolution No. 2 of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers of 22 January 1991.

Public Polled on Food-Buying Habits

OW0907021691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 8 Jul 91

[From "Viewpoint"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In May-June 1991, the National Public Opinion Studies Center took an opinion poll among 1,255 respondents in the Russian Federation, 619 in Estonia, and 631 in Uzbekistan asking them where they usually buy food. Respondents were allowed to give no more than three answers.

Most respondents living in the Russian Federation usually buy food in state shops, 46%—at collective farms' markets and from private sellers, 43% use their own kitchen gardens. Twenty-three percent receive ordered food products at work, 9% get food using personal ties, 7% buy it from profiteers at higher prices.

In Estonia, 98% prefer state shops, 55% grow crops at personal kitchen gardens, 28% buy food at collective farms' markets and from private sellers. Estonians use personal ties for getting food more often than Russians (15%). Fourteen percent order food staples at work, and only one out of 100 pay higher price for food to profiteers.

In Uzbekistan, 87% purchase food at collective farms' markets and from private sellers, 73%—in state shops, 29%—from profiteers. Twenty-seven percent rely on kitchen gardens, 13% use personal ties, 12% get ordered food at place of work or study.

Margin of error—3%.

Economic Expert on Soviet Economy, Cooperation

AU0708212691 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 4 Jul 91 p 6

[Interview with Anatoliy Porohovskiy, deputy director in charge of economic issues of the United States and Canada Research Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, by Laszlo M. Lengyel; in Moscow, date not given: "Our Crisis Is Not a Cyclic One—This Is a Political and Regime Crisis"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Excerpts] Anatoliy Porohovskiy is a university professor and doctor in economic sciences, a former head of the Economic Sciences Faculty and deputy rector of the Lomonosov University in Moscow. He granted us an interview about the chances of the so-called Yavlinskiy program that aims at connecting the Soviet economy with the world economy.

[Lengyel] As a scientist dealing with the United States, Soviet-U.S. relations, and the economy, what is your opinion about the political chances of such a program? Under what circumstances could such a grandiose idea be implemented?

[Porohovskiy] I think that the political situation is favorable now. Indeed, there is no longer rigid confrontation and there is general interest in us in the world today. Our readiness for change has also emerged slowly. Therefore, the circumstances are quite favorable. [passage omitted]

[Lengyel] The Soviet Union is facing a big task today. What are the domestic conditions for this?

[Porohovskiy] They are still weak, because it is very difficult to talk about ways to adjust this federation to the world at large when the very existence of this federation is still questionable. First of all, we must preserve this federation and create its integrity. This does not mean that we must necessarily chain all the republics to this federation, but at least the framework should remain.

The West is also interested in the unity of the Soviet Union, because the West cannot work with each republic separately. This condition could be met with the new federal agreement, but six republics do not want to sign this agreement. However, the West is not in a hurry to embrace each republic separately. We must solve these problems primarily at home.

[Lengyel] Perhaps the momentum has diminished at home and cooperation with the West could be both a blood transfusion and medicine in the ongoing changes.

[Porohovskiy] Eliminating the resistance toward changes is not simply a question of domestic political firmness or foreign guarantees. Life is much more complex than any theory. We have 40 million pensioners and 20 million students, including 4 million university students. At least 60 million people are already living under the poverty line.

These people will support those who promise them security, even at the price of limiting others' prosperity. At least at the beginning, the market does not promise these people anything good. For these people, "secure little" is more important than "uncertain more." Therefore, it is not enough to constantly talk about market, but we must also show what happens to those who are not millionaires, entrepreneurs, or owners.

We must show the welfare system of a market economy, namely that a capitalist abroad is a real capitalist if its employees are satisfied. It is true, however, that there are people who no longer trust anyone, either West and East, or domestic or foreign forces.

[Lengyel] Is this program adequate from a purely economic viewpoint?

[Porohovskiy] It could be adequate if the federation survives. Today, our economy represents a whole only in a certain framework. No matter where it was built, an enterprise supplies—or should supply—the entire country. This situation will change later. However, we need at least 10 years to carry out this restructuring. This is the reason for cycle crises in market economies.

However, ours is not a cyclic crisis, but rather a political and regime crisis. Once we overcome this, we will have restructuring and technological improvement. All this needs time. Privatization in itself is not a solution in the current structure, because this structure does not depend on the forms of ownership. [passage omitted]

[Lengyel] What will the West gain from bilateral cooperation?

[Porohovskiy] First of all, this will provide incentives. As long as confrontation prevailed between the Soviet Union and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO, the West could solve its numerous economic problems by referring to this confrontation. There is no threat anymore and, therefore, economic motives move to the forefront.

There is no more new free market in the West. Therefore, they can only spread toward us. We also have new sources here. Competition has become the major incentive. The Soviet Union has raw material, resources, and experts. Sooner or later, the Soviet Union alone would compete with the West, just like China. [passage omitted]

[Lengyel] I think energy and raw material production could be the most attractive sectors in the first phase of the program.

[Porohovskiy] That is true. Foreigners could be most interested in the energy basis and construction materials—metals, wood, plastics—at the beginning. A technological change would perform miracles even in our current structure. A lot of steel would remain that could be exported. We would bring more oil to the surface from the same well, and less oil would flow away. This could also be exported. We would also use less energy and raw materials, and the surplus could be used elsewhere.

[Lengyel] Can you win the population over for this plan? Can you overcome national pride and selfish thinking?

[Porohovskiy] People here need housing and food, but mainly housing. If someone gives them housing and food, they will never forget him. Aid and charity have their own role, although this is not the essential thing. Psychological factors are very important too. A housing project or cultural center built by a group of foreign capitalists, a project that could carry the name of the sponsor, would convince many people. People would get used to this and would welcome this, and this would overcome resistance. Governments could also join such a program. A considerable strata of the population, especially young people, would support these initiatives.

Latvian Premier Sees More Economic Deterioration

OW0407054391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 3 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia's Prime Minister, Lvars Godmanis, has said in an interview to Radio Riga that the economic situation both in the Soviet Union as a whole and in Latvia in particular was going to deteriorate. He drew this conclusion from Pavlov's forecast that this year the grain harvest in the Soviet Union is going to be fairly poor. Latvia, he said, was very dependent on grain deliveries from the USSR. Its stock breeding entirely depended on imported fodder.

Godmanis believes that, if milk and meat production in the republic is to be cut down, Latvia's deliveries of these products to the Soviet Union will fall accordingly. This will, in turn, lead to a fall in the deliveries of raw materials and industrial components to Latvia, he thinks.

Estonian Delegation Visits Urals, Siberia

OW0907021591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1830 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On July 5, a delegation of Estonia's Government led by the prime minister of the republic, Mr. Edgar Savisaar, began an official visit to Siberia and the Urals.

On Friday, the delegation arrived in Krasnoyarsk. The visit started with a surprise meeting at the city's airport between Mr. Savisaar and Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute for the Study of the USA and Canada under the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. The two men had a brief conversation right in the airport's building.

Upon arrival in the city, delegation members began intensive negotiations with a number of high-ranking officials from the regional executive committee, which resulted in a protocol about exchanges of goods for 1992, signed by Alexandr Sikkal, Estonia's minister for material resources, and Ivan Polishchuk, director general of the Krasnoyarsk Commercial Intermediation Company. The protocol envisages that exchanges of goods, with their current levels kept unchanged, will bypass authorities in Moscow. Those taking part in the meeting declared they were in favour of broadening trade ties between Estonia and the Krasnoyarsk region.

The deal provides that the Krasnoyarsk region will supply to Estonia about 12m rubles worth of metals (aluminium, in particular), chemical products, rubber and other goods.

Mr. Savisaar held talks with Valeriy Sergienko, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Krasnoyarsk Regional Council, with whom he discussed economic and cultural links between Estonia and the Krasnoyarsk region. The two leaders stressed that these relationships must be based on a treaty between Estonia and the Russian Federation, signed in January this year.

Special attention was devoted to the issue of Estonians living in the Krasnoyarsk region, whose number exceeds 6,000 according to the 1989 census.

Estonia's delegation will continue its visit on Saturday when they will go to one of the region's villages with predominantly Estonian population.

Agricultural

'Vremya' Analyzes Agricultural Problems

LD0807214591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Year in, year out we hold forth about the struggle for the harvest, and each time we give the main four causes for the lagging behind of our agriculture. They are winter, spring, summer and autumn—in a word, weather. And now, judging by Valeriy Golubev's commentary, there are even more causes.

[Valeriy Golubev, observer] Droughts, fires or torrential rains, the pessimistic forecasts by the CIA and altogether hopeless comments by our press about the harvest—what can be worse? We are promised foreign purchases of 100 million tonnes of grain, something that spells a round sum of $40 billion. Well, and what about the peasants? They are busy with their age-old task—harvesting. Bread-grain has already been reaped from the first 1.5 million hectares. The yield is 23.4 quintals per hectare, about one-third down on the same time last year. But one should mention that yields are up on last year in the Ukraine and Uzbekistan. There are difficulties in Siberia, northern Kazakhstan and the Urals—there is a dry spell there. But there have been good rains in Tomsk, Kemerovo and, partly, Novosibirsk oblasts.

Well, over my 30 years in the business I do not recall easy bread, as far as weather is concerned. What has obviously become worse is the material and technical supplies to the countryside. There is a shortage of 9,000 Tula reapers for the Don combine harvesters, many spares, and aviation fuel. On the other hand, there is a surplus in talk about foreign purchases at all levels of the administration, although it is absolutely clear that we will have to live on the bread-grain we harvest ourselves. We have to sell 100 million tonnes to state resources. This is for you and me, townsmen. And we have to help the peasants to harvest everything; instead of investing dollars into developing foreign farming, we should take care of our own peasants, so long as they are far from prospering.

Military

Statute on Military Councils Published

PM0807151191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

["Statute on Military Councils in the USSR Armed Forces, USSR KGB Troops, USSR MVD Internal Troops, and Railway Troops. Ratified by USSR Presidential Decree Dated 22 June 1991"—KRASNAYA ZVEZDA headline]

[Text] 1. Military councils are permanently operating collegial military-political leadership organs of the USSR Armed forces, the USSR KGB troops, the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] internal troops, and the railroad troops.

2. In their activity military councils are guided by USSR laws, other Congress of USSR People's Deputies and USSR Supreme Soviet acts, USSR presidential decrees, USSR Cabinet of Ministers acts, orders and directives issued by the USSR defense minister, the chairman of the USSR KGB, the USSR minister of internal affairs, and the chief of the railroad troops, and also the present statute.

3. Military councils are created by the USSR president as follows:

1) in the USSR Armed Forces—in branches of the USSR Armed Forces, 9-13 people; in the main commands of sector troops and in districts, groups of forces, fleets, and categories of troops, 7-11 people; and in armies and flotillas, 5-9 people;

2) in KGB border troops, border districts, and government communications troops, 9-13 people;

3) in USSR MVD internal troops, 9-13 people; and in internal troops directorates, 5-9 people;

4) in railroad troops, 5-9 people.

Military councils in other cases are also created by the USSR president.

4. The following are ex officio members of the military council: the commander in chief (commander, chief), who is chairman of the military council, first deputies of the commander in chief (commander, chief), the chief of staff and the chief of the military-political directorate (department).

Other officials in the military administration organs are approved as members of the military council by the USSR president at the submission of the USSR defense minister, the chairman of the USSR KGB, the USSR minister of internal affairs, and the chief of the railroad troops on the basis of a decision by the relevant military council.

At the submission of the Defense Council under the USSR president, the USSR president can, with their consent, appoint republic presidents and chairmen of republic supreme soviets or their presidiums to military councils, and also the heads of government of the republics and chairmen and deputy chairmen of the kray and oblast soviets of people's deputies and their executive committees on whose territory the relevant military administration organs are stationed.

Members of the military council must personally participate in discussing, elaborating, and implementing military councils' resolutions and answer in accordance with legislation for the solution of USSR defense and security questions within the limits of their competence.

5. Military councils are answerable to the USSR president, the USSR prime minister, the USSR defense minister, the chairman of the USSR KGB, and the USSR minister of internal affairs for the building, development, training, vital activity, and combat and mobilization readiness of the troops (forces) under their command, their fulfillment of combat tasks, their moral-political state, military discipline, and the social and legal protection of personnel, and they also assess the efficiency of the work of military administration organs and officials, implement the selection, placement, and training of military cadres, and examine questions of conferring military ranks and awards.

6. In order to ensure that the tasks facing troops (forces) are implemented, military councils cooperate with organs of state power and administration, and also with organizations of political parties, mass movements, and other public associations operating in accordance with legislation.

Proposals from military councils are examined according to the procedure laid down by legislation by the organs of state administration to which they are sent.

7. Military council sittings are held at least once every two months with the attendance of at least half of the members. The military council determines the questions to be discussed and who is to participate.

Military council sittings are minuted. Military council resolutions are adopted by a majority of votes, separately on each question. The minutes and resolutions are signed by the chairman and secretary of the military council.

The resolutions are binding for implementation by all members of the military council and also subordinate military administration organs and officials.

8. In the event of disagreement with a decision, a member of the military council has the right to report his opinion to the USSR president, the USSR prime minister, the USSR defense minister, the chairman of the USSR KGB, and the USSR minister of internal affairs. This opinion is reflected in the minutes of the military council sitting.

9. Military council resolutions can be implemented by orders and directives signed by the commander in chief (commander, chief) and the chief of staff. Orders and directives on questions of military-political work, political statements and appeals in the name of the military council, and also documents adopted jointly with organs of state power and administration, organizations of political parties, and other public associations are signed by the commander in chief (commander, chief) and the chief of the military-political directorate (department).

10. Military councils periodically examine the results of their work and the contribution of each member of the military council to fulfilling the elaborated resolutions, and systematically inform the organs of administration and officials of subordinate troops (forces) of the work carried out.

11. Military councils and officials of superior military administration organs must carefully examine military councils' decisions and proposals, take them into consideration when adopting their own decisions, and, if they disagree, give reasoned responses.

12. The chairman of the military council is responsible for ensuring in the military council's activity an atmosphere where there is free, principled, and amicable discussion of questions and the opinion of all participants in the sitting is taken into account in decisionmaking, and he organizes fulfillment of the adopted decisions together with members of the military council.

The secretary of the military council is responsible for minuting the sitting, for the military council's clerical work, and with for recording and analyzing progress in the fulfillment of the adopted resolutions.

13. Monitoring of the activity of the military councils is carried out as follows: in the USSR Armed Forces by the USSR defense minister; in the USSR KGB troops by the chairman of the USSR KGB; in the USSR MVD internal troops by the USSR minister of internal affairs; and in the railroad troops by the USSR defense minister together with the USSR minister of transport construction.

Shlyaga on Changes to Military Councils

PM0907092491 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate and USSR first deputy defense minister by unnamed KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent—date, place of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction: "Military Councils: New Circumstances Mean a New Role"]

[Text] The Provision on Military Councils in the USSR Armed Forces, the USSR KGB Troops, the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops, and the Railroad Troops was confirmed by a USSR presidential decree of 22 June 1991. After it was published, the editorial office received many telephone calls requesting us to give more details about this document's significance, and about the specifics of the military councils' activities in present-day circumstances.

Our correspondent met with Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate and USSR first deputy defense minister, and put to him a number of questions of interest to the readers.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Comrade Colonel General, what brought about the appearance of the new Provision on Military Councils?

[Shlyaga] Before the USSR presidential decree of 22 June this year, the military councils followed a provision confirmed more than 33 years ago.

During the time which has elapsed, much water, as they say, has passed under the bridge. The social and political situation in the world, the country, and the Armed Forces themselves has been transformed. Approaches to military organizational development have fundamentally changed. A new military doctrine with a defensive orientation has been adopted and is being implemented. A wide-ranging reform of the Armed Forces has begun, which has required a reassessment of the role of the troops' and naval forces' command structures, along with major organizational, material and technical, and military and scientific measures.

On the basis of all this, an objective necessity emerged for a review of the document defining the rights, tasks, and principles of the military councils' practical activities, with a view to bringing them into line with the new sociopolitical and strictly military realities. The new Provision on the Military Councils should now be seen as the legal basis for qualitatively new collegial organs of military-political leadership.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Nikolay Ivanovich, tell me, please, where and how the work on the draft provision was carried out, and to what extent the military councils' many years of experience and proposals from the provinces were taken into account here.

[Shlyaga] The procedure for drawing up the draft was determined by the USSR Ministry of Defense. The coordinating organ was the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate, which worked in close contact with with the General Staff and other central organs of military administration.

We studied carefully the masses of materials on the military councils' work which reached us, and those ideas which were expressed about improvements in the military districts, groups of forces, and fleets. The draft provision was discussed on more than one occasion by the operational echelon's organs of command, and the observations and proposals enunciated there were taken into consideration. The USSR president's apparatus has done much to get the draft "into shape," so to speak. So the provision is not only the product of the central organs' thinking, but the result of collective labor drawing on many years' accumulated work in the field.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] In what way does the present Provision on Military Councils differ from that which existed before?

[Shlyaga] First, in that the head of state brought it into force. The former provision was confirmed by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers. Second, the 1991 provision is extended to cover those organs of military administration which did not exist in 1958. In particular, at that time, there were no military councils for the missile forces, airborne troops, and railroad troops, among other units. Third, there is an innovation regarding the composition of the military councils. Apart from ex officio members—commanders in chief (commanding officers, chiefs), their first deputies, the chief of staff and chief of the military-political directorate (department)—and other officials of the military administration organs appointed to the military councils by the USSR president, they may also include presidents of the republics, chairmen of republic Supreme Soviets or of their Presidiums with their consent, heads of republic governments, and chairmen and deputy chairmen of kray and oblast soviets of people's deputies and their ispolkoms [executive committees]. What we have in mind is officials of those regions on whose territories the corresponding organs of military administration are located. This type of representation not only increases the military councils' prestige, but also paves the way for an overall resolution of political, social, economic, and ecological problems in the rayons where the Army and Navy units and combined units are deployed and of problems connected with the local organs being being stirred into action to fulfill their obligations in the area of defense.

One other detail. When the military councils carry out their work, they interact with the social organizations in the localities. After all, the military councils' main task is to see that the country is provided with a reliable defense. And this is not just, so to speak, a purely military matter, but a matter for the whole people, the whole state.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Several readers are interested in the mechanism by which the military councils adopt resolutions, and also what measures will safeguard their prestige among the troops and in the fleets.

[Shlyaga] The military councils adopt resolutions by democratic means—by a majority of votes cast by the council members present at its session. However, this in no way means that unity of command is revoked, which still remains that foundation on which performance, organization, responsibility, and discipline in the Army are maintained.

The military councils' resolutions are binding on all their members, as well as on organs of military administration and officials subordinate to them. They may be put into effect by orders and directives signed by the commander in chief (commanding officer, chief) and chief of staff, or in the case of issues concerning military-political work

the commander in chief (commanding officer, chief) and the chief of the military-political directorate (department).

Of course, situations can also arise whereby one of the members of the military council does not agree with the collective decision. In such an instance, he has the right to bring his opinion to the attention of the USSR president, the USSR prime minister, and the USSR minister of defense. And then it is them who, as they say, dot the i's and cross the t's.

The new Provision on the Military Councils has yet one more important element. It has been determined that the military councils and officials of the higher organs of military administration are obliged to carefully consider, and take into account in their work, the decisions and proposals of subordinate formations' military councils. Here, a proviso has been made that if there is no agreement on this decision, they should reply giving reasons. Such a procedure was not present in the provision which was in force before.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Comrade Colonel General, you have emphasized the USSR president's role in the military councils' formation more than once in your replies. Does this mean that his influence on the Armed Forces is strengthened overall?

[Shlyaga] Without doubt. After all, according to the USSR Constitution, the country's president is supreme commander in chief of the USSR Armed Forces.

Soviet Generals Likened to Chicago Mafia

LD0707175591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 7 Jul 91

[From "Review of the Weeklies" program presented by Sergey Belyayev]

[Text] The latest issue of STOLITSA pays special attention to the Army, it seems to me. It contains several polemical articles about the past and present of our armed forces, if one may pay it that way. I would like to review one of these. The article is entitled: "The Mafia in generals' uniforms".

Many of you will no doubt agree that the lives of Soviet generals remain the least well researched aspect of our Army. From time to time we hear of scandals involving luxury dachas, special hunting reserves, or an incautious word or two dropped by some high-ranking officer. Then the wall of silence closes in again. So, what is the ordinary Soviet general like? What is his life like? What motivates him? All these questions are discussed in an article by Vitaliy Urazhtsev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy and chairman of Shchit, the Russian League for the Defense of Servicemen and Members of their Families. In our Army the corresponding figure is one to 1,750. In the Western countries there are three branches of the armed forces—army, navy, and air force. But we have five—for the sole purpose of artificially maintaining a huge number of top ranking officers.

Vitaliy Urazhtsev even makes so bold as to draw a portrait of the statistically average Soviet general. This is what he looks like. He is a crafty, cunning, cowardly, and bureaucratic strategist, who is totally devoted to the ideals of Marxism-Leninism, if only because these ideals provide a comfortable existence for him and his entire family. The cost of maintaining these generals is pretty well incalculable. The sums involved are huge, Vitaliy Urazhtsev remarks. Although our minister of defense, for instance, receives less than a U.S. lieutenant, a U.S. lieutenant cannot keep a mistress at the state's expense, as Marshal Grechko did. Our minister, STOLITSA writes, receives 2,500-3,000 rubles in cash a month. God knows, that's good enough money, the money he can actually count. All his other needs are catered for—transport, apartment, dacha, and ammunition. Naturally he does not have to pay for these. The same applies a rank lower down. Everything you command is yours, as far as the generals are concerned.

Russian deputy Vitaliy Urazhtsev believes that the generals constitute a kind of Mafia. What's more, he notes, this Mafia is organized along the same lines as the Chicago version. In other words, it is divided into clans, with a constant struggle between groupings for positions, titles, and comfortable sinecures for proteges. It is quite difficult to spot the clan allegiances of our generals, Vitaliy Urazhtsev notes. But, generally speaking, his view of the situation is roughly as follows.

The first clan is made up of Far Easterners. These are the generals who in fact now lead the Army. They were all connected by friendships formed in the Far East. Its members are Marshal Yazov, Army Gen. Varennikov, Army Gen. Kochetov, Army Gen. Lushev, and Army Gen. Moiseyev. The second clan is the leadership of the Strategic Missile Forces, commanded by Army Gen. Tretyak. The third is the Naval Command, headed by Admiral Chernavin. The last grouping consists of the highest-ranking officers in the Main Military-Political Directorate. This clan does not make itself conspicuous, but is nevertheless extremely dangerous because its direct guardian is the CPSU Central Committee. They are especially resourceful, with the ability to inflict vicious blows. They have the entire system of cadres under their control. An up-and-coming group consists of Colonels-General Achalov, Gromov, and Makashov, the weekly STOLITSA notes.

It goes on, and I quote: As with any Costa Nostra, the groupings have spheres of influence and specialize in certain types of business. The naval group concentrates on maritime contraband from hot countries. They bring in anything for which there is the slightest demand in the Union, ranging from women's tights to video equipment. The Far Easterners, it seems, are now concentrating on the import of cars from Europe and narcotics from Afghanistan, while Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, for

example, has decided to take personal control of the money which Kohl is paying us for the withdrawal of our troops from Germany. Evidently, Yazov is a very good economist. The political workers, in their turn, deal in anything they can lay their hands on—positions, titles, Party cards, or exemption from party fines.

So, that's an article which appears in the latest issue of the illustrated weekly STOLITSA. RSFSR [Russia Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy Vitaliy Urazhtsev gave the editorial board a guarantee that he was prepared to answer for each of his assertions.

Two Servicemen Kill, Wound 13 in Zolotinka

OW0907050991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1030 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] 2 servicemen killed 8 of their fellow-soldiers and wounded another 5. This happened Saturday evening at a unit of USSR interior ministry troops stationed near the village of Zolotinka in Neriungri region, Yakutia. Two 20-year-old servicemen attacked the chief of the guard, seized the keys to the room where arms were kept from him, snatched submachine guns and opened fire on their fellow- soldiers who were viewing TV. 6 young men were killed instantly. 7 were wounded. 2 of them died in hospital. The killers escaped. A search is under way. The motive for the crime is yet unknown.

Superiority of Yak-141 Military Aircraft Cited

SK0807052591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 0900 GMT 3 Jul 91

[From the "Soviet Science and Technology" program]

[Text] A new type of military aircraft, which was manufactured by the Yakovlev Aeronautics Design Bureau of the Soviet Union, won great popularity at the international aviation exhibition held in France some time ago. It was learned that during the test flight, this aircraft set a new record in various fields including speed in vertical take-off and flying speed.

Let us hear about this from the reporter of this radio station.

This military aircraft, called Yak-141, is a pursuit and capture plane [chugyok pochakki], and can easily take off from a short runway and can fly vertically from such a narrow place as a warship deck.

This airplane inherited the tradition of the Yakovlev Design Bureau, of the sixties and seventies, on a new higher stage and in a concrete manner.

When we take a look at this airplane, which has the shape of an arrow, we are reminded of the remark, "the airplane with a good shape can also fly superbly."

Yak-141 not only has a handsome [kobta] shape but also excellent armaments. Besides, the steering system and navigation system are ultra-modern and can be operated day and night irrespective of weather.

Let us hear about some merits of this aircraft. As everyone knows, fierce competition always takes place among leading aviation firms of the world. Yak-141 shows remarkably superior functions over the same-class airplanes of Britain's Harrier and (AV) of the United States.

For example, this aircraft attained the supersonic speed of 1,800 kilometers per hour for the first time for and airplane carried on a warship. Airplanes of the same class in other countries reached the speed of only a little more than 1,000 kilometers. The highest flying altitude of Yak-141 is 15,000 meters, and that of Britain's Harrier and (AV) of the United States is 11,000 meters.

Furthermore, this aircraft is used for various purposes, including capture of aerial targets, close mobilization combat, and attacking targets on the ground and at the sea. The major function of this airplane is its superiority in terms of load capacity. In other words, this aircraft is capable of flying while carrying two and half tons of various weapons. This shows more load capacity than that of the same class of aircraft manufactured in Britain and the United States.

Yak-141 has already set 12 new world records. One of these records is the time required for reaching an altitude of 15,000 meters. This time, Yak-141 set this record by breaking the record which has been monopolized by Britain's Harrier since 1980. Moreover, Harrier aircraft made this record without carrying a load but the Yak-141 set this new record while carrying a one ton load.

In Answer to the question of the reporter about plans to sell this military aircraft to foreign countries, (Aleksandre Dondukov), senior designer of Yakovlev Aeronautics Design Bureau, said the following:

We propose to choose another way. In other words, we would like to jointly develop airplanes capable of taking off vertically. I think that a joint venture with India will be realized in the future. Talks with Italy and England are also under way.

Next, the reporter asked if the design of this airplane can be used for manufacturing civilian aircraft. To this, (Dondukov), senior designer, explained: As far as I am concerned, I consider it necessary that civilian aircraft also turn to the type capable of taking off and landing vertically in a small space.

The reporter then asked if his design bureau had begun to develop this type of aircraft. The senior designer said the following: The new generation aircraft we are developing will certainly be this type.

Zbigniew Brzezinski Pays Visit to Baltics

Meets Estonian Premier

OW0507143791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1834 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Zbigniew Brzezinski, an American politician, former adviser to U.S. President on national security, professor of the Columbia University, who had come to Tallinn to take part in the international conference "East-West Business Relations" had a meeting with Prime Minister of Estonia Edgar Savisaar today. The details of the meeting have not been reported yet.

On Friday Z. Brzezinski is expected to meet with Chairman of the Estonian Supreme Council Arnold Ruutel.

According to unofficial Estonian sources, Eduard Shevardnadze who was invited to Tallinn will not attend the conference and meet with Z. Brzezinski.

On Settlement of Baltic Issue

OW0807034791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1000 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Zbigniew Brzezinski, ex-national security adviser to the U.S. President, believes that settling the Baltic dispute peacefully may secure for Russia the role of a full-fledged participant in the European process and help it establish normal relations with the West. Addressing a news conference in Riga, Latvia, on Thursday, he expressed support for the Baltic republics' desire for independence which he said could be implemented in the near future. Mr. Brzezinski indicated that the Baltic states' real independence would be a key factor in the future security system and an instrument to improve East-West relations.

The U.S. politician questioned the view that a country cannot be fully independent if another country's troops are stationed on its territory. According to him, the chief problem is whether or not the local government permits it. Mr. Brzezinski said no one would think of doubting the independence of Britain where U.S. troops are deployed.

At the same time, he said there should be a transitional period guaranteeing Soviet security and putting the Baltic states in a position to obtain their indepencence.

Zbigniew Brzezinski has arrived in Tallinn to take part in an international conference on business relations between East and West. He has been meeting with people in other Baltic capitals as well.

Document on Economic Losses of Secession

OW0507085591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1330 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Soviet governmental circles have developed a document "On Possible Economic Losses Resulting from the Secession of Some Republic from the USSR", said press-secretary of the Estonian Economy Ministry Enno Tamm to BF [BALTFAX] on Thursday.

According to him, the 35-page document analyses the losses the Soviet economy will incur in case the 6 republics withdraw from the Union and economic prospects for each of them.

According to Tamm, Moscow views Estonian economy as having the brightest prospects due to its powerful energy sector and agriculture.

The document says that the secession of the 6 republics will cost the USSR 2 percent of its territory, 7.5 percent of the population, 7.1 percent of the industrial production volume and 8.2 percent of the agricultural production volume.

The principal losses will be:

Estonia: Nuclear Power Ministry's factories Dvigatel and Baltiets, a chemical factory in Sillamae using shale, pulp factories and the factory Norma.

Latvia: the Daugavpils Engineering Factory, the Riga Avtoelectropribor Factory, the VEF and Alfa factories.

Lithuania: the Vingis Factory in Vilnius, the Banga Production Association, the factory Ekranas in Panevezhils, a fuel equipment factory in Vilnius and a compressor factory in Penevezhis.

The Estonian Economy Minister expressed surprise that the list does not contain several famous factories such as the RAF and a railroad car maker in Riga.

The document expresses the Soviet leadership's special concern that with an independent Lithuania, the Kaliningrad region will be cut off from the USSR's territory, and treaties with Poland or Lithuania will be required, if supplies to the region are to be provided.

Estonia

Official Urges Tougher Stand With USSR

OW0907082391 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1000 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A member of the Estonian delegation to talks with the Soviet Union, Endel Lippmaa, has said in an interview with the newspaper EESTI EKSPRESS that "solid

arguments" and "a tactic of competence and consistency" should be used in the dialogue with the USSR. He criticized Latvia's "mildness" which he said "can get Latvia nowhere," and added that this kind of tactics was much less supported the world over than "the tough stand adopted by Lithuania and its President Landsbergis."

Mr. Lippmaa was openly pessimistic about the next round of Estonian-Soviet consultations, due August 6.

The latest meeting of the two delegations is known to have yielded zero results, giving Estonia the reason to acknowledge a "drastic deterioration" in its relations with the Soviet Union. According to E. Lippmaa, the chief Soviet negotiator, Nikolay Laverov, was acting on a mandate from President Gorbachev who was still hoping to get the Baltic republics to sign the new Union Treaty.

Under the existing schedule, the August 6 consultations will be devoted to the historical and juridical evaluation of Estonia's incorporation into the USSR. Mr. Lippmaa indicated his delegation was "thoroughly preparing for the debates" which he felt could be heated. He said the Soviet side's main trump card could be the signature of Estonia's pre war President Konstantin Pats on the documents concerning the transfer of power. The counterargument would be that five divisions of the Red Army had been stationed on Estonian territory by the time the documents were signed. Under international law, this means Estonia was under occupation, which invalidates the presidential signatures.

Lithuania

Landsbergis Supports Slovenia, Croatia

OW0807042691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1830 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Speaking over the national radio today Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis touched upon the developments, as he put it, in "former Yugoslavia."

"Lithuania and the two Yugoslav republics are absolutely different in legal aspect. Slovenia and Croatia are struggling for independence and recognition which were gained by Lithuanian in 1918-20", he said. "We understand very well and support them."

Mr. Landsbergis also said that what makes the republics alike is "communism which is the same in Moscow and Belgrade, where tanks supress the aspiration of nations for freedom".

Mr. Landsbergis expressed readiness to recognizethe independence of Slovenia and Croatia. "We expect that it will become more clear whether Slovenia and Croatia really plead for international recognition and establishment of diplomatic relations", he said.

Lithuanian Opposition's Problems Viewed

PM0907095591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jul 91 First Edition p 6

[Captain Second Rank V. Gromak article: "Is It Easy Being in Opposition?"]

[Text] This can be answered straightaway: Being in opposition is not easy. This is graphically shown in relations between the republic Supreme Soviet, the government, and various nationalist groupings, on the one hand, and the Lithuanian Communist Party on the other. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already written a considerable amount about this. But why has a new opposition organization—the Forum for the Future of Lithuania [FFL]—appeared? Let us turn to the facts.

"People want to express their concern for Lithuania's future, but they are immediately branded an enemy. This is how the danger of becoming enclosed in the benighted circle of a single opinion arises"—these are the words of Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Ju. Karosas, one of the initiators of the FFL's formation. Nor is it an accident that the process of the emergence of the new movement began last fall, when the essence of V. Landsbergis' policy was already clearly evident: his commitment to totalitarianism, intolerance of other peoples's opinions, reliance on force in the struggle with his opponents, and so on.

So who has joined the FFL? Representatives of the Social Democratic Party, the Democratic Labor Party (formerly the independent Communist Party), the Union of Liberals, and other political structures. As a rule they are people who were in at the beginning of Sajudis and are loyal, as the newspaper TIESA recently noted, to the still glimmering ideas of this people's movement. In other words, they are forces who stand for the gradual, measured acquisition of independence.

It would seem that they ought to get a considerable number of supporters in Lithuania. Certainly, that is so. But conflict with the authorities began immediately when the FFL assembled for its first conference in April.

Judging from the press, Landsbergis did not like the criticism voiced at the FFL conference of "Lithuania's tough and uncompromising position in its relations with the Kremlin" and of the government's economic mistakes. So it is entirely logical that the FFL organizers were called "Reds" and "the Kremlin's fifth column" at a rally of right-wing forces held afterward. Ju. Tuljamis, chairman of the Council of the current Sajudis Sejm, expressed himself very specifically, too: The main culprits for the fall in parliament's rating are the Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party's emissaries.

The newspaper RESPUBLIKA recently noted: "Although not much time has elapsed since the FFL

conference, it seems that Lithuania's life is changing in essence right now. An economy that is sliding into an abyss, talks with the Kremlin, and relations with other Baltic republics have been brushed aside. We are struggling against 'enemies of the people.'"

Such a situation could have been foreseen. It is no accident that back at the time when the FFL conference opened the experienced politician K. Antanavicius (incidentally, he is a republic Supreme Soviet deputy) stated:

"Yes, the brave people of Lithuania who were not frightened of coming to this hall will be honored."

Later events showed that it really is necessary to be a brave person here. Any actions by the FFL and especially by the Democratic Labor Party, which is part of it, have certainly become the subject of clashes organized by the quasifascist Lithuanian Freedom League. Moreover, the sound of explosions has already been heard several times at such events.

One has only to recall that in May alone the League for the Defense of Lithuania provoked several conflicts during speeches by FFL organizers (13 May in Kretinga, 20 May in Plunge, 22 May in Panevezys). So, there is some food for thought.

It is typical that the new opposition is often compared to the Lithuanian Communist Party. In this respect it is worth noting a recent article by literary critic V. Kubilis in LIETUVOS AJDAS, in which he wrote: "Right now an opposition which would save rather than sink the state is needed, thereby receiving praise and blessings from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. These embryonic organizations have a considerable number of points in common with Lithuanian Communist Party policy."

Incidentally, in this case a more "rational way" of counteragitation has been chosen. Because the Lithuanian Communist Party is now experiencing a very difficult period. To a certain extent the authorities have managed to form the opinion that past and current troubles in the republic are the Communists' fault. There is no escaping from that. But the Lithuanian Communist Party's attitude to the FFL is especially interesting in the present case.

In the opinion of the republic Communist Party Central Committee Ideological Department, the FFL's formation is brought about by the changing sociopolitical situation. And, I was told, the forum's formation should be welcomed as an organization of democratic purpose forming an opposition to the Supreme Soviet's antipeople policy. But attention should also be paid to the contradictions arising as a result of ideological inconsistency among a section of this movement's figures, their connivance with separatism, and the ineffective methods of political activity used by them. After all, taking part in the FFL's work are a considerable number of Sajudis organizers who actively participated in splitting the Lithuanian Communist Party and helped to secure parliamentary seats for Landsbergis' supporters.

In my view, a prime example in this category must be A. Brazauskas, the former Lithuanian Communist Party leader and now leader of the Democratic Labor Party. He is meeting with the public very often at the moment. Maybe it is his last chance to stay afloat politically.

I remember his recent meeting with inhabitants of Novaya Vilya. This is how Brazauskas addressed those assembled: "Esteemed comrades." True, he immediately clarified: "Terms of address are changing today, like our whole life."

And here is yet another observation. A meeting was held between the public, Archbishop Khrizostom, head of the Orthodox Church in Lithuania, and Brazauskas in the Vilnius Palace of Trade Unions. Answering a question from the audience about the link between him and Brazauskas, the archbishop said: "Simply that we are not ordinary." "Marxism-Leninism affirms good principles," "I have never come out against the Communist Party"—these are also Khrizostom's comments. But the Democratic Labor Party leader answered the questions somewhat differently. When somebody sent a note saying "Do you believe in the dogma of Marx and Lenin?" the recent first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee rather frostily replied: "Please spare me these questions. That is all in the past."

As we can see, the "new opposition" in politics has not come up with anything new. It is just that the situation in the republic is so contradictory and the people are so exasperated by the half-baked policies of the Lithuanian parliament and government that any contrary acts are interpreted as a sign of bravery and decisiveness.

At any rate, the FFL has a chance of becoming a real opposition force along with the Communist Party. And, it must be said, the "new opposition" had quite a hectic June. They started setting up forum organizations at the local level. Such a "cell" appeared in Vilnius 25 June.

It is another matter that, given the FFL's activization, the authorities will try to utilize a prerehearsed mechanism of provocations which operated, for instance, in the republic prior to the January events. Many observers do not preclude such an outcome.

In this connection the FFL Coordinating Council recently made the following statement:

"Moral and physical terror and dictatorship are coming to replace dialogue with the public. This could have grave and unpredictable consequences. These phenomena run counter to the republic's constitution and contradict the basic principles of democracy and human rights. They are compromising Lithuania in the eyes of the whole world. Politicians and parties who base their activities on terror have no future and must be outlawed. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet leadership, the government, and all political parties are obliged to discuss the situation that has arisen and express their point of view."

Alas, silence is the only reply. And parliament, having set up a commission to examine instances of terror in relation to the FFL, just cannot be bothered to listen to it.

Yeltsin Visit to Novosibirsk Continues

91UN2032A Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 July 91 p 1

[Vyacheslav Dolganov report: "Do They Have the Time for Science?"]

[Text] Novosibirsk—For the chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, 2 July started with a visit to the exhibition in the foyer of the House of Scientists in Akademgorodok. Just everything was there! And for the most part things that everyone needs in everyday life. Science was demonstrating its possibilities in the service of man. Medical lasers and infrared imagers, video tape recorders and video monitors, instruments for measuring the radiation background level of environmental contamination, domestic appliances, computer systems, food products, including new varieties of cereals, fruit, and vegetables, highly effective drugs that have just been developed for treating dental diseases and ulcers, even space equipment and sports equipment....

Alas! Much of what was being shown still exists only in the form of experimental models produced on an individual basis or in small batches.

"What is happening with our science? What are the problems that are hampering its development in Russia and in Siberia?"

These were the questions that B. Yeltsin asked those who accompanied him at the exhibition—the experts and developers who were providing the detailed explanations, and also the scientists and members of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch Presidium. Branch chairman, Academician V. Koptyug, talked not so much about basic and applied research, but rather enumerated the ills and shortcomings of the scientific institutions in Siberia. The potential of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch is enormous. Its scientific centers operate in Novosibirsk, Irkutsk, Omsk, Tomsk, Krasnoyarsk, Ulan-Ude, Yakutsk, Tyumen, and Kemerovo, with separate institutes of the academy in Barnaul, Kyzyl, and Chita. Among the almost 12,000 scientific workers there are 36 academicians, 65 corresponding members, 900 doctors, and about 6,000 candidates of science. However, the domestic disorders are impinging increasingly on both the course and results of research work, and on their introduction into production.

"A major Japanese scientific center," Academician V. Koptyug says, "was created on the model of and in a similar way to our Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch, but the Japanese went on to create a technopolis, that is, they combined the scientific institutions into a single complex with the industrial enterprises. And they have no problems with respect to the immediate introduction of the latest developments into production. But we are forced forever to chase after this...."

"And how do people live? What about the housing situation?" asks the head of the Russian parliament.

"Well, things are generally bad here. The salaries of the scientists in Siberia are small; we are even behind, say, the Ukraine, where, of course, living conditions are incomparably better. In Akademgorodok 6,000 people are on the waiting list, out of a population of 80,000. The 'brain drain' abroad is posing a serious threat for our science in general; not a day passes without me having to sign someone's departure documents. As before, our scientists are highly regarded in the world. And so they leave—both experienced personnel and promising young people. Science in Siberia has started to age, and the influx of young scientists and engineering personnel has declined sharply; many of them are leaving their work in academic establishments and going to cooperatives, plants, and higher educational establishments."

It should also be noted that B. Yeltsin drew attention to the fact that the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch finds itself hung in a position between the center and Russia, taking money from the republic to maintain this very large scientific center, and is simply "recoloring" it in a Union hue, to use the words of Academician V. Koptyug. The total amount of funding is about 500 million rubles [R] annually, but only R200 million come from budget allocations while the scientists themselves earn the other R300 million by fulfilling economic agreements and goal-oriented programs and winning competitions. They can scarcely exist on this kind of funding. They need R1 billion as a minimum. It is essential to create immediately on Siberian territory an international research center. This would not only reduce the number of departures by our scientists to go abroad but also attract foreign colleagues for joint research.

"We shall consider that the plans of the president of Russia will include one more urgent and extremely important section devoted to the problem," B. Yeltsin noted. "This will be in the section on the links between science and industry and the rapid introduction of the results of scientific activity into production."

The Russian leader stated officially that one of his first ukases will be a ukase transferring to the jurisdiction of Russia all enterprises located on republic territory. A similar step has already been taken in the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and a number of the other Union republics.

After his meeting with scientists of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch in the House of Scientists, B. Yeltsin familiarized himself with the activity of the academy institutes. Interesting "roundtable" talks took place at the Institute of Nuclear Physics. The subject matter covered promising ways to develop power engineering and the real and imaginary need for nuclear weapons testing, which now costs the country enormous sums and exerts a baneful effect both on the ecology and

on the health of millions of people, and also on the conditions in which academy science will survive in a future market economy.

Later there was a visit to the Institute of Geology and Geophysics. There, B. Yeltsin was interested in learning how the mining industry makes practical use of basic research, and about the resources and reserves of minerals available and that can be used in the immediate future in the RSFSR, and what needs to be done to improve efficiency in the recovery of oil and gas, gold, diamonds, and the precious and semiprecious stones of Siberia and the Urals.

At the Novosibirsk instrument plant B. Yeltsin conversed with the manager and the leading experts at the enterprise.

In the evening representatives of the labor collective in Novosibirsk gathered at the sociopolitical center to meet the Russian leader, after which he left for Moscow.

Backs Siberian Development

PM0807154191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Andrey Illarionov: "Yeltsin Supported 'Siberian Accord'"]

[Text] Novosibirsk—Boris Yeltsin, who arrived in Novosibirsk Monday [1 July], signed an ordnance concerning the activity of the interregional association "Siberian Accord."

With a view to making efficient use of Siberia's production, technical, and scientific potential and developing a new model of economic management mechanism, Yeltsin supported the initiative of republics, krays, oblasts, and autonomous entities regarding developing territorial cooperation and implementing joint projects in the most important economic and social areas. In particular, he supported the formation of a territorial fund of commodity resources, which will help to stabilize economic life.

Members of the "Siberian Accord" association are given rights in respect of foreign economic activity. A special insurance fund will be set up to guarantee foreign economic commitments.

Yeltsin Holds Talks With Spanish Prime Minister

LD0907092691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0840 GMT 9 Jul 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 9 Jul (TASS)—The development of direct, multilateral links between the Russian Federation and Spain were at the center of attention at a meeting that took place today in the Russian House of Soviets between Boris Yeltsin, the president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez.

In an interview with Soviet and foreign journalists after their conversation, Boris Yeltsin noted that he "had a meeting with a very interesting interlocutor."

According to the Russian president, problems in carrying out economic reforms in the Russian Federation, including aspects such as privatization, the dismantling of state control, and the gradual transition to a market economy, were discussed in great detail. Boris Yeltsin reported that the sides agreed to set up working groups in the near future to draw up a program for cooperation between Russia and Spain.

Yeltsin: Draft Union Treaty a 'Good Foundation'

PM0807222191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[Report from the PRAVDA, TASS, RIA, and URAL-AKTSENT roundup under the general heading "Around the Country:" "Boris Yeltsin Considers the Conclusion of the Union Treaty Necessary"]

[Text] The draft Union treaty is being sharply criticized by many Russian people's deputies. But Yeltsin considers that the Union treaty, despite serious comments about the draft, "is a good foundation for work on the new Constitution of the Soviet Union." He has urged Russian parliamentarians to show common sense and "think about the state that both the country and Russia are now in." Russia "is losing out every day" because there is no Union treaty nor even that minimum demarcation of functions which is enshrined in this draft. "They are pressuring us every day!" the Russian president said.

Leadership Urges Support of Union Treaty

OW0807130691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Friday, the Russian Federation's parliament opened debates over the draft Union Treaty suggested by President Gorbachev. In his brief introductory speech chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov said that procrastination about the treaty's signing might lead to negative consequences. The people of Russia had voted for a strong union presidential elections in the republic had been unity-oriented, too. The USSR President was determined to seek closer contacts with the republics; the world community was seriously concerned about the USSR's future and would like to see it as a single country.

On behalf of President Yeltsin and himself, Mr. Khasbulatov urged parliamentarians to support the draft

treaty and proceed without delay to form an official delegation that would finalize the document and endorse it.

Boris Yeltsin informed the parliament that President Gorbachev's latest conference with representatives of 9 republics had revealed considerable differences on 4 articles of the draft treaty. A fifth one, suggesting a two-channel system of taxation, was opposed only by Russia and the Ukraine which continued pressing for a one-channel tax system.

Udmurtiya Approves Union Treaty

LD0607213391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network 1600 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] At the Udmurtiya Supreme Soviet session today in Izhevsk, the deputies approved after prolonged deabte the draft treaty "on the union of sovereign states" in is entirety.

The republic of Udmurtiya—the resolution reads—signs the treaty on the union of sovereign states as a state within the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

It is worth adding that, in order to make such an important decision, the Udmurtiyan parliament was compelled to take time out which lasted many days, and the final conclusion was only reached at today's session.

Tatarstan Approves Draft

LD0607220191 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 5 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Sorokin]

[Text] Kazan July 5 TASS— The Tatar parliament approved, on the whole, the draft Union treaty today and at the same time expressed its own opinion of it. Tatar legislators did not agree with some of its provisions which, in their opinion, are at variance with the constitutional status of the republic. An official resolution was adopted on the direct and independent signing of the Union treaty by Tatar representatives.

"Our stand remains unchanged: we want first to sign the Union treaty ourselves, then to sign a treaty with Russia," Tatar President Mintimer Shaymiyev said at the session. "Unfortunately, the Novo-Ogarevo 'nine plus one' statement limited the number of founders of the renewing union by the number of yesterday's union republics, without including former autonomous republics. Thus, it divided members of the Federation Council into first-rate and second-rate. But all should be equal in the union."

If Tatarstan signs the Union treaty by itself, the Union property, which makes up 80 per cent of its industrial potential, will be transferred to the jurisdiction of the republic. Consequently, we shall receive additionally three billion roubles in the forthcoming two years, Shaymiyev stressed.

Karelia Approves Treaty

LD0707172991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 7 Jul 91

[Text] The draft treaty on the union of sovereign states has been discussed and approved at a session of the Karelian Supreme Soviet. This took place after a debate in which a group of deputies said the document should be voted down or deferred. The majority of deputies, however, arrived at the conviction that without a Union treaty there will be a delay in tackling many economic problems. The debate at the session as to how Karelia should sign the treaty—as an independent delegation in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic delegation, or as part of the Russian Federation—was no less intense.

A third option was picked. The Karelian delegation will be headed by Stepanov, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Silayev Interviewed on Democratic Reform Movement

LD0807180791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] [Announcer Oleg Klimov] An important event last week was the announcement by nine prominent politicians in our country about the creation of a Democratic Reform Movement. Our correspondent Sergey Belyayev met Ivan Silayev, the head of the Russian Government, who is one of the nine. Here is a recording of their conversation.

[Begin recording] [Belyayev] I began my conversation with the Russiam prime minister by asking him whether the Democratic Reform Movement would remain only a movement or whether it would be transformed into an independent party. What are the prospects for its development? Here is what Ivan Stepanovich Silayev told me.

[Silayev] I believe that the principle that we have chosen (?for this movement) is the right one because we want to consolidate the forces of the democrats and radical thinking citizens in the Soviet Union, and Russia in particular. At the moment they are fragmented. They lack homogeneity. They include a significant number of Communists who currently belong to the CPSU, who hold radical views. There quite a few of these. For instance, there are the Communists for Democracy, a body of people's deputies who form their own deputies group. All this shows that there is a need, first, for this movement and, then, for the emergence of a party of democratic reform which would not, of course, set itself the task of liquidating [words indistinct] the CPSU, but which would, first and foremost, influence the policies currently being pursued by the right wing of the CPSU. Its most important task, however, would be to consolidate progressively minded Communists. There are quite a few of them who find themselves in a difficult situation today. On the one hand, they see that the old approaches hinder the processes of detente, the processes of democratization. On the other hand, it is not all that easy to

take the decisive step of severing ties, leaving the party, and so on. Therefore, we are addressing all those who, in the interests of society, really are prepared to work for democracy, progress, and the implementation of, first and foremost, radical reshaping of the economy on market principles.

Now is the time for every Communist and non-party member, those who have never joined a party or who belong to other parties, to think things over again and decide where they stand, what they believe in—in other words, those who hold civic positions. We should help them to decide where they stand.

[Belyayev] The Democrats themselves, the supporters of the movement, accuse you of not defining your position toward the CPSU, and CPSU people say that all the ideas you are putting forward are fundamentally compatible with those which were adopted at the 28th CPSU congress.

[Silayev] There is quite a lot in common but there are also very fundamental differences. But there is nothing surprising about that. Political life is complex, and ordinary people, representatives of other sections, students, engineers—they are stratified in their views on various fundamental questions of the economy and politics. In the first place, however, they draw inspiration from the results of the Russian presidential election. They voted not only for Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin personally—although that played a very important role—but also for the policies and program that he has adopted, for his demand to have the right to be the first president. Therefore, this shows that the bulk of the Russian population were expressing support for democratic reform, for radical reform. Consequently, I hope, I believe that the citizens of Russia will take their bearings on this direction, and decide whether they should support it by simply voting for it or by some other forms of moral support, or whether they will want to do something more specific in the ranks of this movement, and then in the ranks of a party.

[Belyayev] One of the nine—Shevardnadze—has already announced that he is leaving the CPSU. Are you going to make a similar announcement?

[Silayev] Not in the immediate future. [end recording]

[Klimov] You are listening to the news. That was an interview with Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers.

Ready To Join

PM0807222791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[Report from the PRAVDA, TASS, RIA, and URAL-AKTSENT roundup under the general heading "Around the Country:" "Ivan Silayev Ready to Join New Democratic Party"]

[Text] Ivan Silayev is ready to join the new democratic party if the "Movement for Democratic Reforms" is transformed into a political party. Together with other political leaders in the country, he signed the appeal on the creation of the movement. "A month ago I tendered my resignation from the CPSU Central Committee. I hope that the plenum at the end of July will resolve this question. But of course, a man isn't allowed to belong to two parties," Silayev said. "I do not think that my stance surprised anyone," he added. "I support radical reforms, democratic transformations, and the elimination of all the various politicized structures which deform executive power. Unfortunately, a number of our very major radical reforms are being slowed down in places where they are being hindered by conservative communists. As a leader of an executive organ I can see all this and feel it personally," the head of the Russian Government said.

Parliament Backs Silayev on Dispute With Union

PM0807121991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 91 p 1

["RSFSR Supreme Soviet Resolution"—ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA headline]

[Text] On the statement of Comrade I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers in connection with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers Resolution No. 360 of 15 June 1991.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To endorse the stance of the RSFSR Council of Ministers upholding the state sovereignty of the Russian Federation and the observance of the new fundamental approaches to cooperation, collaboration, and the quest for mutually acceptable solutions between the republic and the center.

2. To accept resolution No. 368 adopted by the RSFSR Council of Ministers 27 June 1991 "On organizational measures to elaborate production programs and forecasts of the socioeconomic development of enterprises, regions, republics, and the USSR for 1992 in conditions of the formation of market relations."

3. To charge the RSFSR Government with undertaking vigorous action with a view to the early signing of the "Program of Joint Actions on the Part of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the Governments of Sovereign Republics to End the Crisis in the Country's Economy in Conditions of the Transition to the Market."

4. To draw the attention of the USSR president to instances of irresponsible decisions on the part of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, which is under his jurisdiction and which has violated accords and agreements achieved between the republics and the center.

R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet

Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets, 28 June 1991

Khasbulatov on Role of RSFSR Supreme Soviet

LD0807170891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1209 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, answers listeners' questions relayed by Vitaliy Ushkanov in studio—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Ushkanov] I will begin with my question. The point is that looking at ROSSIYA weekly today I discovered that you apparently consider the elections for a chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet premature and are proposing that they be held in autumn 1991 or even spring 1992. I was a little suprised and am asking you now to explain your position.

[Khasbulatov] Well, first of all I would like to say hello to Radio Rossii listeners. Well, now, answering this question I do not even know from which article such opinions are being ascribed to me, all the more so as the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet has submitted quite a precise agenda. It was then proposed to the Supreme Soviet and it has been approved. Immediately after the president formally takes up his post the first issue is the organizational issue and the elections for chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet. It is quite clear that since the president will act without delay and, I think, effectively a chairman of the Supreme Soviet with ideals is also needed. There is no doubt about this. Admittedly there were views by individual deputies that it might be expedient to move elections to the autumn but I and Boris Yeltsin did not support this approach at all and proposed this logical agenda. So it is most likely that the journalists of our newspaper probably confused something. In any case, this idea does not belong to me. [passage omitted]

[Uskanov] There is now such an opinion—that Boris Nikolayevich is now engaged in the creation of presidential structures, structures of executive power, he is looking at what the parliament is engaged in and he has not yet himself decided what kind of parliament he needs, an obedient or refractory one. How could you evaluate such an opinion?

[Khasbulatov] You know, I think that in this case the parliament needs to define itself, but strictly following the existing laws. It is not now the president who should define what the parliament should be like. [passage omitted]

The Supreme Soviet should of course create a favorable sphere of action for presidential power, so that it might be effective. But at the same time the control functions of the Supreme Soviet should naturally be preserved and should even, in my view, be strengthened. [passage omitted]

The control functions have been weakened. The Supreme Soviet, nonetheless, as a parliament, a legislative body, has turned out to be insufficiently prepared to monitor the execution of its own laws. For this reason, now when these higher levels of power are being put in order and the principle of division of power is being implemented—to a greater extent than was ever the case previously—the Supreme Soviet should of course concentrate its attention precisely on the control functions, not only on legislative ones. This is the first point. The second: the Supreme Soviet should of course very definitely defend its own rights and its priveleges before presidential power. And third: Good, amicable relations should of course exist between the Supreme Sovet and the president, but relations based on principle.

Of course, it is very important for the Supreme Soviet not to become some kind of auxiliary body. But it was, in my view, very clearly demonstrated that it will not become so on Friday when, from 1000 until 1900 we discussed the problems of the Union treaty under my chairmanship. [passage omitted]

[Ushkanov] Is it really true that you and Boris Nikolayevich have not had basic differences of opinion and does this mean that in the future everything will be....

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] You know, of course it is not like that. But the point is that perhaps much is connected with my nature. I am not the one to publicly announce that I have, say, divergences of opinion with this or that person, or with a third person, and so forth. Of course, there have been, and on more than one occasion, differences on certain major issues and on minor issues. But the fact of the matter is that Boris Nikolayevich is one of those rather strong personalities who knows how to listen attentively to the person with whom he is talking. And he and I have argued and expressed our thoughts out loud very seriously, even on the Union treaty, I should tell you, and remember Boris Nikolayevich's famous speech on television when he demanded the USSR president's resignation? On this, our stances were quite seriously different. But time passed and it turned out that I was wrong. Why? Because the central administration was stifling and blocking all our laws, like a gigantic wave. And under those circumstances, of course, a very strong public shock was required, so that people, our compatriots should see, finally, the true picture. [passage omitted]

[Ushkanov] Here is a question from Reserve Colonel Kurbanov, relating to my question: Do you believe in the bright future of communism and if not, then what binds you in the same party as Polozkov?

[Khasbulatov] [passage omitted] As for the matter of my being in the same party as Polozkov, well, what can be done? That is the way our party has been. The spectrum of our Communist Party does, after all, unite the most different people. Gorbachev said there are probably three or four parties here—do you remember, at the plenum, if I am not mistaken? But I said even earlier that

there are not three or four, but ten parties, ranging from true Democrats and Humanists with capital letters to fascist elements of some kind. They are altogether in one party. Why? Because there has always been one state party. [passage omitted]

I have no problem with whether or not to come out of the party, but I look at it this way. If people like me and others are to come out, what will the party become? Will it not become some kind of extremist organization that will carry out very destructive deeds in our country? It is this fact that also bothers me somewhat. I have to say that this is a very serious matter for me.

[Ushkanov] And what is your attitude to this Democratic Reform Movement that has just emerged?

[Khasbulatov] Positive in all respects. [passage omitted] In principle, I do not reject the communist idea. That would be unscientific and incorrect with regard to history of civilization. But it is another matter to put us in a practical plane and to try today or tomorrow to build a communist society. That, of course, is adventurism. [passage omitted]

[Ushkanov] The fact that both you and Svetlana Petrovna Goryacheva work in the presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, as well as members of the six who signed the well-known letter proves the fact that communists indeed are all very different. Incidentally, there are many questions about Goryacheva. I think we should answer them. For example, Dmitriyeva from Moscow asks whether Goryacheva will stay in the government, she means in the top echelons of power, and Goryunova from Moscow asks why Goryacheva has not been recalled yet, and Olga Simchenko inquires about your attitude to Tsvetov's program on Goryacheva's activities, and Muscovite Ivanovskiy asks about cooperation between you and Svetlana Petrovna, whether what had taken place affected the possibility of working side by side.

[Khasbulatov] You see, it happened that two deputy chairmen of the Supreme Soviet came out with well-known statements. I also had to comment on this in some way. But my efforts were directed at making sure that such a statement did not affect the work of the Supreme Soviet and the presidium and that the first impression created by journalists—that they are engaged in nothing but personal squabbles and so on there—did not stay. Thank God, we succeeded in this. Of course, the rather strong authority of Boris Nikolayevich contributed to this. It turned out to be impossible to break up or undermine the activities of either the Supreme Soviet, or the presidium. As for relations, they are of purely official nature and do not exceed the boundaries of official relations. There should be trust, of course, in relations between leaders of such rank, there is no doubt about this. If there is no trust, there is no work. I think that when the chairman of the Supreme Soviet is elected he will probably propose some changes to the Supreme Soviet, no doubt. It cannot happen otherwise. But, of course, it all depends upon who will be elected. It is only the congress that can make the decision and the will of the congress must be the law for all. As for the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, he has the right to nominate the first and the second deputy and any other deputy according to the constitution, or even cut down these posts as in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Ushkanov] Sergeyev from Nalchik asks when the RSFSR constitution is to be adopted.

[Khasbulatov] Finalizing is currently under way. There have been many remarks, you see. We do not want... and the principled position was such as not to try and foist on people the constitution which does not satisfy our fellow-citizens. that is why we spent so much time discussing it and you know, also published it several times. At present we are including some amendments and remarks into it. Well, I think that it will be well into autumn that we will manage to submit the constitution. [passage omitted]

National Impact of Presidential Election Viewed

PM0907080391 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No. 25, Signed to Press 18 Jun 91 pp 6, 7

[Aleksandr Tsipko article: "Two Centers Equals Two Russias?"]

[Text] The elections confirmed an assumption I had come to way back, and the celebrated demonstration of 28 March on the opening day of the Russian Congress of People's Deputies strengthened it: In our conditions the people line up behind everyone who opposes the powers-that-be and the Communists. The elections showed how illusory and unfounded were the assumptions of the group surrounding Gorbachev that our people are committed to socialism and believe in and are devoted to communism. The poll in Leningrad, where the majority of the inhabitants voted for the city's name to be changed to St. Petersburg, confirmed that the spirit of restoring the past and repudiating communism and all its symbols, everything connected with it in our country, is as strong as in East Europe.

The elections showed that the country's leadership made a tragic error at the start of perestroyka. The problem of saving the country should have been separated from the problem of saving socialism. An ill-considered, to put it mildly, concept of the socialist option ultimately alienated the bulk of the population from reforms and from Gorbachev. Unfortunately, the mass of our compatriots are so politically immature that democracy here becomes a primitive process of choosing a pleasing personality.

The new demagogy—the "first free elections in Russia"—arouses an inner protest in me. First, the RSFSR is not Russia, and so this concept should not be blithely employed, in my opinion. It can be said that the old Russia has died and a new one emerged, but then it is necessary to explain what we have in mind when we say "Russia" and what sort of historical formation we mean by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist

Republic]. Second, this is tactless because it negates 1917 and the elections to the Constituent Assembly. I am afraid that we are heading for a democracy based on historical nihilism and a reluctance to see the genealogy of the democratic process.

Another feature of the elections worthy of attention is that, although we had representatives of various political movements as candidates, they all to a man eschewed party affiliation. Why did Ryzhkov constantly stress that: Yes, he was supported by the RSFR Communist Party, but, no, he did not embody it? Why did Bakatin persistently stress his independence from the the CPSU? And why, finally, was even Yeltsin forced to say that he represented only himself, although he was in sympathy with the "Democratic Party?" This phenomenon shows that we can scarcely hope for the emergence of a multiparty system in the near future. The practical forms of democracy in our country are highly primitive: A contest of personalities and exploitation of the high feelings and suppressed instincts of the population. Do we possess sufficient political knowledge and moral and spiritual strength to have really free elections on a multiparty basis? At present some people are motivated by fear of losing gains, others by hatred of the past.

With the establishment of the Russian presidency the threat of a struggle between two centers—the old, Union center and the new one that has emerged as a result of the declaration of RSFSR sovereignty—arises again. It is clear that nothing in the country will budge until this conflict is resolved. And here the most varied scenarios for the development of events are possible. Either you will have what the ideologues of "Democratic Russia" are counting on—the election of Yeltsin as president immediately consecrates him as a rival to central power and his elevation thus threatens Gorbachev himself, which the democrats regard as guaranteeing rapid future changes. Another scenario, and a realistic one in light of the signing of the Nine plus One agreement, is as follows: Yeltsin automatically consolidates his position on the republic level like Nazarbayev, Kravchuk, and others. For the center this is a boon, but the process of democratization in the country could be delayed because of it. Nevertheless, it is Yeltsin who has constantly spurred the center to action.

Yeltsin ran a brilliant election campaign. His address on Russian television—modest, calm, without strident anticommunism—showed that he has his finger on the pulse, he is a product of the times, and he understands them.

Yeltsin was bound to win because in voting for him people were primarily voting against Gorbachev. Such is the logic of the transition from totalitarianism to democracy. All who dare to embark on change and assume responsibility come under fire from both sides—left and right.

Zhirinovskiy Expects Power 'Very Soon'

LD0807180191 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Fomicheva]

[Text] Leningrad July 8 TASS—Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, a recent contender for Russia's presidency, who placed third at the June 12 presidential elections by the number of votes he polled, visited Leningrad today at the invitation of the workers of the steel mill and Baltic shipyards.

Zhirinovskiy, chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party of the Soviet Union, told the work collectives about his party's programme and his vision of how the country should get out of the crisis.

"I view my defeat in Russia's presidential elections as the beginning of an upward road," he said. "Our party will come to power very soon and I will immediately offer my version of how to get out of the deadlock: I shall sharply change the orientation of foreign policy, resolve ethnic problems by changing over to the division of territory into regions and guberniyas. Instead of the three Baltic republics, there will be one guberniya headed by Governor-General Alksnis."

The guest also visited the Baltic shipyards, met seamen from the Leningrad naval base, and was recorded by the popular television program 600 Seconds.

Measures Adopted To Increase Grain Supplies

LD0807194791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] The chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers today adopted an instruction setting forth additional measures for establishing grain and other state food reserves in 1991. The Information Department of the RSFSR Council of Ministers reports that the document, while retaining the compulsory tax in kind [prodnalog] for grain deliveries to the state which was introduced in 1991, also sets forth a number of market incentives to provide economic stimulus for collective farms, state farms, peasant farms, and private farms to sell gr. in for state reserves. In particular, purchases of grain over and above the tax in kind levels, and those from farms to which the tax does not apply, are to be conducted at contract prices and encouraged by reciprocal sales, in the third and fourth quarters of this year, of agricultural equipment and material and technical resources, as well as consumer goods, at state wholesale and retail prices. Up to 50 percent of the grain sold over and above the tax in kind level can be paid for in freely convertible foreign currency, effectively at the prices for grain purchases abroad, the foreign currency proceeds to be credited to farms during the period up to 1 March 1992.

Grain, buckwheat, rice, and pulses sold to state reserves are also to be paid for at free contract prices. At the cost of reducing the reserves available to consumers in general in the second half-year, 100,000 cars, 200,000 refrigerators, 150,000 washing machines, and 200,000 television sets are being additionally allocated for reciprocal sale in return for grain, oil-bearing crops, and potatoes sold. Of the aforementioned resources and goods 10 percent will be earmarked for collectives at processing

and procurment organizations. The crediting of funds in foreign currency to the accounts of collective and state farms, peasant and private farms, and other agricultural enterprises in return for grain sold by them to the state is to be effected by the RSFSR Foreign Trade bank during the three months following completion of the sale of such grain for state reserves. Amounts and procedures relating to payment in kind—in grain, potatoes, vegetables, and fruit—to harvest workers, including those taken on from industrial enterprises, are to be determined independently by agricultural producers.

Russian Law on Foreign Investment Passed

OW0507181991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russian Parliament passed on Thursday a law on foreign investment. In his comments to IF [INTERFAX] chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's Committee for International Affairs and Foreign Economic Ties Vladimir Lukin said that the discussion of the bill in the second reading only took 30 minutes as it had been thoroughly considered and endorsed by Russian and international experts.

Lukin emphasized that the law gives foreign investors a status that is little different than that of domestic business people. There are insignificant restrictions on foreign business in fields that can compromise the republic's security. According to Lukin, the law "provides major guarantees against nationalisation and arbitrary actions guarantees that can be protected by Soviet courts of arbitration and an international court if an investor wishes so".

Lukin cites among the virtues of the law "very simple rules for the registration of investors and the fact that this is a direct-action law that is well-coordinated with other pieces of legislation in this sphere".

Foreign Minister Cited on London G-7 Meeting

LD0707083191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1030 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Excerpts] A summer session of the Ekosos economic and social council attached to the United Nations is taking place in Geneva. Over to our correspondent in Geneva, Seyful Mulyukov.

[Mulyukov] [passage omitted] Participants in the Ekosos session welcomed the forthcoming visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president, to London to meet the heads of the seven leading Western states. A Soviet delegation led by Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] foreign minister, is taking part in the Ekosos sitting. What do you expect from the present Ekosos session, I asked the RSFSR foreign minister.

I expect a lot of things, he said. The thing is that we have to understand correctly what we can get from the world community, including international organizations. First of all, it is the knowledge of how to do things. But we will have to do them ourselves, Comrade Kozyrev said. Everybody understands that our reforms will require a great concentration of our will and decisiveness to advance quickly, but not hastily, along the path of radical economic reforms.

I think, Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev continued, that the Soviet leadership is planning to open up the country even further for international cooperation. In this context they are saying a lot of positive things about the forthcoming visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to London to meet the leaders of the seven countries. The fact that the Russians voted for the president who came forward with a program of radical economic reforms, and the previous factor, are seen here as a signal of hope.

State of Emergency Lifted in Makhachkala

LD0807202191 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Gadzhi-Abdulla Shamov]

[Text] Makhachkala July 8 TASS—A working week in the capital of Daghestan has begun without militia and military patrols on the streets and without militia or OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] roadblocks. The situation in the city has stabilised, and the presidium of the Daghestani Parliament has cancelled the resolution on a state of emergency that was imposed here on June 13, 1991.

On that day a group of rowdies from among Moslem believers attacked the Daghestani Government building in Makhachkala with a view to seizing it. A timely intervention by militia and OMON riot squads made it possible to withstand the mob pressure. But feelings continued to run high. Moslem believers continued to insist on their demands that all those who wish it—of whom there were more than 10,000—be allowed to make hajj and that travel costs be reduced.

Those demands could not be met because decisions on such matters are outside the competence of the republican government.

Considering the threatening behaviour of those taking part in the rally and their insulting shouts and acts, people's deputies at an emergency session had to take a decision to impose a state of emergency in the city.

Democratic Support Deserts Mayor Sobchak

PM0807145991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent N. Volynskiy report: "Carrying the Can"]

[Text] Leningrad—Addressing Soviet and foreign journalists at a press conference, Leningrad Mayor A. Sobchak firmly stated that he is going to put a stop to the

mess caused by deputies when these elected representatives of the people busy themselves with a myriad of affairs unrelated to their prime duties.

Such resolute intent on the part of Sobchak has worried Democrats before; now, however, it has caused real commotion in their midst. One of the consequences of such feelings was the sensational statement made at a session by Deputy G. Kravchenko, a member of the commission on questions of legality, who alleged that gross violations had occurred during the conduct of the mayoral elections, that they were therefore invalid, and that he and his group intend to challenge the results in the courts. When Sobchak was asked by me what his attitude was to such an open threat, he produced yet another sensation: In his opinion, this action was hatched inside PRAVDA! Good Lord, how wondrous are your works. Even unconcealed opponents of PRAVDA were unable to contain their laughter at the press conference.

Another piece of news became public the same day: Deputies who had enjoyed the reputation of being the "creme de la creme" of the Democrats had failed to get onto the Leningrad Soviet Presidium. Until recently they had been regarded as ardent and devoted supporters of Sobchak. These include, among others, M. Salye, responsible for food; Yu. Rybakov, the human rights crusader; and A. Boltyanskiy, a fine orator. In response the Democrats are putting up fierce opposition to Sobchak's receiving the powers granted him by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet.

What a commotion in the Marinskiy Palace. As a result Sobchak has found himself in a difficult position: He is primarily being opposed by the People's Front and other democratic structures. Only V. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the oblast party committee, has firmly and openly stated his support for Sobchak. But with the proviso that this support extends only to those mayoral undertakings which do not run counter to the interests of the people.

Disaster Relief Rescue Corps Established

PM0507132491 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 24, 16-23 Jun 91 p 4

[Vladimir Gubarev report: "Rescue Team: Life More important Than Politics"]

[Text] Russia's Rescue Corps (RRC), set up in keeping with the resolution of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated July 17, 1990, was registered by the republican Ministry of Justice as a public organization on May 21, 1991. In addition, the next session of the Supreme Soviet may grant it the status of a state organization. If this happens a practical step will be taken towards the establishment of a National Guard in the Russian Federation with many of the functions previously fulfilled by the army.

The RRC President Aleksandr Shcherbakov, former missile force captain, told the MN [Moscow News] correspondent that his organization was not political and did not participate in political conflicts. Although, he believes, the presence of neutral observers in regions where such conflicts are particularly acute could have a stabilizing effect on the situation. It is common knowledge that most crimes are committed without witnesses.

The RRC will be based on the principles of a professional army—one-man command and tough discipline, a system of contracts, competitive selection and wages corresponding to the high risk and extremely difficult working conditions (a minimum of 500 rubles per month, no ceiling mentioned—even the highest wages will hardly be too much for saved lives). The lives of rescue rangers will be insured.

The RRC was set up to save the lives of civilians at times of natural disaster and catastrophe. In 1989, still without official status the Corps demonstrated its abilities in Spitak (Armenia), then in Tajikistan, Georgia and elsewhere.

As time passes the RRC leaders face a lot of problems. Sponsors and partners are being sought. Problems of technical equipment and personnel will possibly be settled through conversion. Officers transferred to the reserve can put their practical knowledge to good use by joining the RRC. For many of them, this is perhaps the only way of adapting to civilian life. When RRC representatives met Marshal Kulikov the figure 5,000 was mentioned as the number of officers to be selected to become members of the Rescue team.

Incidentally, the RRC president is not so optimistic about those who come from the army: "Our army, on the one hand, has brought together the best experts in various fields. But, on the other hand, it is redolent of ignorance."

Rescue rangers pin great hopes on the state of emergency law which would create a legal basis for their actions. But today everything depends on military and civil authorities, whether they are allowed to enter the area of a natural disaster or not.

There are also veteran rescuers. Vladimir Kavunenko, HQ chief, received an International Rescue Ranger certificate in 1956.

When our MN correspondent asked what they expect from the elections of Russia's President, Aleksandr Shcherbakov replied: "Whoever wins the elections it is obvious that rescue operations will remain a must in our troubled times. But it would be better if this work is done by professionals."

Moldova

Snegur on Romanian Ties, Independence Issue

AU0807213791 Bucharest TINERETUL LIBER in Romanian 3 Jul 91 pp 1, 4

[Interview with Mircea Snegur, president of the Republic of Moldova, by Madalina Bumbea Orasanu—date and place not given: "Let Us Stick to Our Kin, Let Us Be Realistic in Politics!"]

[Text] [Orasanu] Moldova was the only republic represented at the highest level at the Forum Congress this year. What does this international meeting mean to you?

[Snegur] It is high time for Moldova to come out of an anonymous state and enter Europe. We had the opportunity there to present the so-called calling card of our republic. We held talks with high dignitaries and businessmen.

[Orasanu] All the representatives of republics took the floor on the first day of discussions except for you. Did you have a specific reason for not taking the floor then?

[Snegur] Somebody from all the represented republics had to make a point. And we thought that it would be right for Moldova to make that point.

[Orasanu] What is your position regarding the current stage of the changes occurring in the Republic of Moldova and what are the most difficult problems that hamper your progress?

[Snegur] I would need much more time to be able to enumerate all our big problems. Now first of all we have to clarify exactly who we are and where are we heading. Now, we are at a crossroads. Officially we still have not gotten out of the framework of the Soviet Union and the legal framework does not allow us to hold a dialogue with the people. The position of the leadership of the Republic of Moldova was made clear a long time ago: independence; sovereignty; a demilitarized zone; mutually advantageous relations with all countries, primarily with our neighbors, Romania and Ukraine; participation in the establishment of free economic zones; the use of foreign investments in the process of modernizing the republic; the creation of appropriate conditions to ensure a happier life for our diligent and peace loving people.

[Orasanu] In your speeches you keep repeating a sentence which has become memorable for us: "Let's stick to our kin." What is the message laying in this recommendation?

[Snegur] Let us not forget where we come from and let us not forget that we have the same roots. Let us not forget that we speak the same language, we sing the same songs, and we love each other. Thus, let us stick to our kin and let us be realistic in politics! In the current international context, we will progress toward an integration in all areas—intellectual and economic ones. More than that we cannot achieve at the moment. And I believe that this idea has been understood by everybody. At the end of my visit to Romania, at the end of February, I stopped at the foot of the Neamtul Fortress, where many people gathered, among them many Bessarabians. We talked, we listened to each other's woes, and we encouraged each other. My words were understood. We are not alone in Europe, but still we cannot decide on our destiny alone; there are certain international agreements which must be observed. And people said: "That is right Mr. President, that is right! Let us stick to our kin, let us establish joint ventures, let us be each other's guests, and let us simplify border crossings. Let Sofia Vicoveanca sing accompanied by the fiddlers from Chisinau [Kishinev] and Mihai Constantinescu sing in duo with Anastasia Lazariuc.... What else do we want, are we not kin?

Legislators Approve Privatization Law

LD0607092491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1705 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Text] Kishinev, 4 Jul (TASS)—After several days of stormy debate, the parliament of the republic of Moldova today adopted a law "on privatization." It defines the basic points of how privatization will be carried out in the republic and has considered all proposals submitted by deputies, as well as many points of alternative draft laws, reports the MOLDOVA-PRESS agency.

The act of legislation which has been adopted provides for privatization to be carried out in several stages. The basic means of transferring to civilian ownership property belonging to the state will be special distribution bonds which will be issued to citizens in the republic who have reached the age of 18, considering their work service, qualifications, and their contribution to creating the republic's national wealth. The distribution bonds cannot be a subject of buying and selling or be passed on to others. Those who have drawn up the draft bill believe that this will enable equal starting-off conditions to be created for all the citizens of the republic during the period of the real switch over to the market and free enterprise and for social justice to be observed to the maximum. This is precisely why the law provides for the fact that kollektivs of enterprises and organizations will not be able to obtain the right to any privileges or distribution of ownership of their own enterprises, factories, plants, and establishments.

Privatization will be controlled by a special body which will be subordinate only to the parliament of the republic: the State Department for Privatization. This law does not define the procedure for privatizing floor space and facilities in the social sphere. This process will commence only after the corresponding acts of legislation have been adopted.

The law "on privatization" will come into force ten days after its publication in the press.

Ukraine

First Presidential Election Set for 1 Dec

LD0607135491 Moscow TASS in English 2027 GMT 5 Jul 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondents Aleksandr Litvinov and Mikhail Melnik]

[Text] Kiev July 5 TASS—The election of the first Ukrainian president will be held on December 1, this year. This resolution was adopted today by the republican parliament, which discussed a package of laws on executive presidency.

The head of the Ukrainian state will be elected by Ukrainian citizens by secret ballot on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage. The post can be held by a Ukrainian citizen no younger than 35 on the day of the election. He cannot be a people's deputy, cannot hold a post in a state institution, a public association or some other organisations, and cannot engage in commercial activities. Good command of the Ukrainian language is an indispensable condition. The post of vice-president will not be instituted.

Fokin Rejects State Property Draft Agreement

LD0707075191 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 1900 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Prime Minister Fokin has termed unacceptable the draft agreement between the USSR and sovereign republics on principles of dividing state property and functions on its destatization and privatization, prepared by the government of the country.

In a letter to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, he notes that the draft contradicts the declaration on state sovereignty of the Ukraine, the law on economic independence of the Ukraine, and the resolution of the Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet on placing state enterprises and organizations that are subordinate to the union and situated on the territory of the republic under the jurisdiction of the Ukraine SSR, not to mention the fact that this document has no legal basis. It envisages conditions that are discriminatory in their nature.

In particular, it is stressed in the letter, it is envisaged in the draft agreement to secure the USSR's right to carry out destatization and privatization in spheres which form a considerable part of industrial and scientific and technical potential of the republic. According to legislative acts adopted by the Ukraine SSR, the process of destatization and privatization of all enterprises and organizations situated on the territory of the republic is exclusively covered by terms of reference of bodies of state power of the Ukraine and, therefore, propositions on rate of deductions should come from the republican bodies.

Parliament Rejects Romanian Territorial Claims

LD0707040691 Moscow TASS in English 2355 GMT 5 Jul 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondents Aleksandr Litvinov and Mikhail Melnik]

[Text] Kiev July 5 TASS—The Ukrainian parliament adopted a statement today about the document by the Romanian parliament "On the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and its consequences for Romania", which actually put in a territorial claim to the Ukraine. The point at issue is North Bukovina and Pridunavie, that were part of the Ukraine from time immemorial. In 1918 they were occupied by monarchist Romania and later reunited with Soviet Ukraine.

The statement of the Ukrainian parliament says that no document shows a deviation of the Ukraine from its principled course towards the liberation of those Ukrainian lands from foreign domination. The recognition of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact as an illegal document does not justify the illegal annexation of the Ukrainian lands by Romania or any claims to them now or in the future.

According to the statement, the Ukraine's state borders were fixed by the 1946 Paris peace conference and recorded in a peace treaty with Romania in 1947. Thus, the existing border dividing the Ukraine and Romania is not the result of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. It is the result of the post-war peace settlement, which was confirmed in the Helsinki Final Act and other documents.

The Ukrainian parliament regards the statement of the Romanian parliament as running counter to the letter and spirit of the Helsinki accords, as a document suggesting the revision of the post-war borders and depriving the Ukrainian nation of the right to be the master on its territory. The parliament stressed that the Ukraine was rejecting any claims to its land, no matter where they come from. The Ukraine is open for the development of bilateral relations with Romania on the basis of generally recognized principles of international law, the statement of the Ukrainian parliament says.

Deputy Explains Union Laws Abolishment

LD0807104591 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 7 Jul 91

[Excerpts] As we already reported, the government of the Ukraine has halted the validity on the territory of our Republic of certain decrees of the Soviet president, of several legislative acts of the country, and of decisions of the all-Union Government which are connected with taxes on enterprises, associations, and organizations with the special purpose of using hard currency resources, forming hard currency funds, and establishing tax amounts for export and import operations. It has been done with the aim of speeding up the implementation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Government's anti-crisis program.

This decision of the Ukrainian parliament has aroused great interest in the world. During the last two days, Radio Kiev has been drowned by telephone calls. Our listeners in the United States, Germany, Great Britain, and France ask us whether this decision of Ukraine's Supreme Soviet does not amount to a confrontation with the center.

Our correspondent, Serhiy Hubin, talks with Deputy Vasyl Stepenko:

[Begin recording] [Stepenko] No, I do not see it as confrontation. I see it as an attempt by our government and by our Supreme Soviet to get out of the economic crisis. In my view, this is what we have to do. In the prevailing war of laws, in this chaos, in this life which is more like miserable existence, we have no other way.

The USSR Supreme Soviet is to adopt a decision on privatization of property which belongs to the Union. It includes even the property that is owned jointly by the Union and republics. Now what sort of sovereign state will a republic be if on its territory an enterprise working on local raw materials will be owned by Moscow? Can you see any logic in this?

[Hubin] As I see it, the adoption by the Ukraine's Supreme Soviet of these decisions over the last few days virtually means that the war of laws becomes more intense.

[Stepenko] According to the Constitution, on our territory the laws of the Ukrainian SSR are supreme. In fact, no war of laws is taking place. What we have before our eyes is an extremely difficult path to the Ukraine's sovereignty. We are not against other republics, but we are against the unitary center, from which all suffer, to an equal degree—Russia, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, and others. [passage omitted]

[Hubin] What about our debts to the center, in particular to the stabilization fund?

[Stepenko] First, we will have to sort out who or what caused these debts, and how much every republic owes. If loans were taken for buying foodstuffs for Moscow and Leningrad, then the Ukraine has nothing to do with them. If we are a sovereign state, we can organize loans ourselves, and also pay them back ourselves.

[Hubin] What a paradox. It turns out that the center owes us quite a sum, if I remember correctly: around 80 billion rubles, which were simply taken from the Ukraine. [passage omitted]

[Stepenko] Yes, this sum was revealed by Leonid Kravchuk in his interview. [passage omitted]

Illegal Export of Products From Ukraine Exposed

PM0807121191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent M. Odinets report under "Ticker Tape" rubric: "What's a Bribe?"]

[Text] Ukrainian newspapers are reporting that in Zhitomir an attempt by a group of Azerbaijan traders to export 26 crates of butter purchased in the stores has been halted.

While in Cherkassy a certain R. Papasyan from Armenia managed to "con" a sales assistant in a rural furniture store and dispatched to the Caucasus three sets of furniture plus two crates of butter and two sacks of flour and groats. As they say in the Ukraine, he "gave a bribe." The illegal deal was discovered, but the containers holding the sets of "Isabel" and "Aurora" furniture and the other produce have disappeared. Likewise, the purchaser is in hiding in an unknown location. Instead, the attention of the law-enforcement organs was drawn to his intermediary, A. Gasparyan. He approached an Interior Ministry officer conducting the inquiry and started offering him a stream of increasingly expensive bribes: 500, then 1,000, then 3,000 rubles [R]. His attempts were unsuccessful. Then Gasparyan approached another investigator and offered him a bribe of R5,000. Only then was the briber arrested.

Speaking on republic television, V. Fokin, chairman of the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers, announced that on the railroads this year around 5,000 attempts were made to illegally export beyond Ukrainian borders several thousand tonnes of butter, tens of thousands of bottles of vodka, and a large quantity of meat products. He told of the detention at Verdyavsk airfield of a military aircraft which was on hire to the trade-brokerage firm "Progress." Several tonnes of beef, 400 kg of butter, and other produce were discovered on board the aircraft. The pilots intended to head for Yerevan.

Georgia

S. Ossetian Panel Hold News Conference

AU0807093391 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0700 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] A press conference was given in the Republic of Georgia Supreme Council by members of the trilateral interparliamentary commission that has been studying the situation in Shida Kartli, specifically in the former South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast.

For two months, the commission has been carefully studying the situation prevailing in the region and has reached the conclusion that the existing conflict is hindering the normalization of the restoration of the state independence of the Republic of Georgia which the Georgian nation supported in the referendum of 31 March 1991. In addition, certain forces are trying to violate the territorial integrity of the Republic of Georgia. The commission recognizes the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Georgia. Members of the commission Gela (?Chagaoshvili), [names indistinct] informed representatives of the press and television of the commission's conclusions.

Army Paper on Gamsakhurdia 'Blockade' Claim

PM0807110991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[Report by Colonel L. Arshantsev under "Direct Line" rubric: "Whatever Ye Shall Sow..."]

[Text] Tbilisi—In April KRASNAYA ZVEZDA had already informed readers of the self-imposed blockade organized by Georgia's railroad workers and port workers to protest the presence of USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops in South Ossetia. Let us recall that at that time long-distance passenger trains and other trains which had set off from Georgia to various regions in the country and, conversely, those bound for the republic, had come to a halt. Goods were accumulating at seaports, threatening to choke them. The Union incurred huge losses, as did Georgia itself, incidentally, which, entirely on its own initiative, failed to receive a large amount of valuable freight. "War, it's just like war!" Z. Gamsakhurdia commented on the situation at the time, not without pathos.

But the other day the SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA [Free Georgia] newspaper published his letter to USSR President M. Gorbachev. And once again it is about a blockade, but now with an inverse sign. It follows from the letter that on this occasion "all transport facilities carrying freight, agricultural products, foodstuffs, and so on destined for the republic are being illegally detained on the territory of Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays and are undergoing examination, after which they are as a rule being redirected or sold to the local population." And the same situation, Gamsakhurdia claims, can also be observed with the blockading of transport facilities allocated for the transportation of medical equipment and medicines from Western countries to Georgia, which is particularly affecting the regions of the natural disaster that hit the republic. In short, an interregional "rail" war is in progress of which Georgia itself was the instigator. In other words, whatever ye shall sow...

Armenia

Supreme Soviet Discusses Renewed Clashes

LD0607194891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1814 GMT 6 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 6 Jul (TASS)—The situation around Nagorno- Karabakh, the autonomous oblast in Azerbaijan which is populated by Armenians and the status of which is being disputed by Armenia, has intensified again.

At an emergency session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet convened as a result, its chairman, Levon Ter-Petrosyan, reported that clashes had occurred after subunits of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs troops left three Armenian-populated villages in Geranboy rayon, Azerbaijan, this morning.

This took place in accordance with a decree of the USSR President issued this week on lifting the state of emergency in Gerbanoy and Dzhebrayl rayons, which adjoin Nagorno-Karabakh.

According to Levon Ter-Petrosyan, as a result of clashes which occurred between Armenians living in these villages and the Azerbaijani militia, there are dead and injured on both sides.

Gorbachev Blamed for Interethnic Conflicts

LD0807160191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 8 Jul (TASS)— The Armenian Supreme Soviet has placed the responsibility for the renewed deterioration in the interethnic conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh and other areas of Azerbaijan with Armenian population on the USSR president and has appealed to leaders of the "Big Seven", drawing their attention to "flagrant human rights violations in the USSR."

The Supreme Soviet's statement, adopted on Saturday at an extraordinary sitting of the session, was published today. It describes the actions of all-Union bodies and the Armed Forces as "pressure on the authorities in the Republic of Armenia on account of their political line of building an independent, democratic state."

Without having taken any real political steps to stabilize the situation, in the opinion of Armenian parliamentarians, the USSR president issued a new decree on 4 July that "yet again acknowledges the completely uncorroborated false promises of the leadership of Azerbaijan to be the only guaranteee of the protection of the rights of citizens of Armenian nationality."

According to the statement, the president's decree "virtually amounted to an order to deport the population of Shaumyanovskiy rayon," says the document.

"This action, which was sanctioned by the USSR president and which is being implemented by the regime in Azerbaijan," stress the members of the Armenian parliament, "is in fact holding back the processes of normalization and contributing substantially to the destabilization of the situation throughout the USSR."

The Armenian Supreme Soviet has appealed to all Union republics "to demand that the leadership of the Soviet Union stop using their citizens who are on military service in punitive actions against the peaceful population."

Supreme Soviet Criticizes Army Action

LD0807184691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Text] A regular session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet has adopted a statement saying, in particular, that a powerful military force of the Soviet Army, USSR Internal Ministry troops, and Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia Detachment units has gone into operation on the pretext of searching for Armenian guerrillas and checking passports. As a result, 41 people have died and about 70 have been injured in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, Getashen, and Martunashen alone. Some 335 civilians have been taken hostage, of whom 189 have been released. The statement goes on to say that the Armenian Supreme Soviet draws attention to instances of crude violation of human rights in the USSR, and expresses its determination to use every possible means to protect the security and dignity of the Armenian population.

Kryuchkov Warned of Planned Action Against OMON

LD0907093691 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT 9 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan July 9 TASS—Chairman of the Armenian parliament Levon Ter-Petrosyan warned Chairman of the KGB of the USSR Vladimir Kryuchkov of the intention of the Armenian side to take decisive actions against Azerbaijanian OMON [Special-Purpose Militia Detachment] units in Azerbaijan's districts with Armenian population.

The chairman of the Armenian parliament told the parliament's session on Monday that he had a telephone conversation with the chief of the KGB of the USSR the previous night.

He said that according to the information of the chief of the KGB, the Azerbaijanian side is aware of the presence of "Armenian militants" in Armenian villages on Azerbaijan's territory and intends to check passports. The chairman of the Armenian parliament pointed out to Kryuchkov that similar measures had led to incidents with bloodletting earlier this year.

"I made it plain that nobody will be spared and nobody will be permitted to enter these villages", that the attackers "will be repulsed". "We closely follow developments and are constantly in touch with Moscow," Ter-Petrosyan said.

He said that units of Soviet interior troops are stationed around the villages that are in a pocket of fresh aggravation of the conflict. "They so far play the role of an observer and do not interfere in the conflict", he said.

Azerbaijani Plans To Deport Armenians Noted

OW0907031791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1530 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Armenian permanent representation's press center reports that as a result of operations against Armenian population on the territory of Azerbaijan in May-June this year, all residents of the villages of Getashen, Martunashen, 4 villages in the Berdadzorskiy district of Nagorno Karabakh's Shushingkiy region and 13 villages of Nogorno Karabakh's Gadrutskiy region were deported by force. Azerbaijanis have already moved into 3 of the villages. A report by the Armenian permanent representation submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet says 40 people have been killed during this period.

The report indicates that 453 Armenians have been taken hostage from May through June. 322 to them were released after being tortured and humiliated. 3 persons were killed and 75 wounded. The report provides details of events in the zone of Armenian- Azerbaijani conflict following the presidential decree lifting the state of emergency in the Shaumyanskiy region of Azerbaijan.

On July 6 - next day after the decree was published the Azerbaijani OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] special force and Azerbaijani KGB units launched attacks against the Armenian villages of Manashid, Buzlukh and Erkedzh of the Shaumyanskiy region in Azerbaijan killing 62-year-old tractor driver Arutunian Edik and wounding 3 people. Further bloodshed was prevented with the help of USSR interior Ministry troops.

On July 7 night a missile attack on the village of Erkedzh left several houses damaged and 1 person wounded. The OMON has issued an ultimatum for residents to leave the villages within 2 days.

The report notes that this explosive situation continues because the zone is surrounded by numerous Azerbaijani armed units.

According to the latest reports, the Azerbaijani leadership intends "to settle" within few days the problem of Armenians living in the Shaumyanskiy region by deporting them. With this purpose various provocations are being organized designed to mislead public opinion concerning intentions and actions of the Armenian population in Azerbaijan.

KGB Remarks on Passport Checks 'Lame Excuse'

OW0907024691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 8 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Armenian news service SNARK reports that the Supreme Soviet of Armenia appealed on Monday to parliaments in other Soviet republics to demand that Moscow stop using their citizens in punitive actions against peaceful civilians in Nagorno-Karabakh and in Armenia's border districts.

The appeal followed a report by head of the republic's parliament, Levon Ter-Petrosyan, on the latest events in Armenian- populated villages in Geranboy (Shaumyan) district of Azerbaijan (at the border with Armenia). According to Mr. Ter-Petrosyan, during "passport-checking operations" there on Saturday, one Armenian and 3 Azerbaijanis were killed, and 3 Armenians and 7 Azerbaijanis were wounded, including 4 persons gravely.

On Sunday, units of the Azerbaijani OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] (special police) had been seen amassing near the villages of Erkech, Buzluk and Manashid before they attacked Erkech at 23:30 (local-time) but were thrown back by Armenian self- defense forces.

L. Ter-Petroysan said he had spoken about the incident over the telephone with the KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov who had told him that "the passport-checking operations were needed because of the presence of militants in the mentioned villages," which argument the Armenian leader found to be "a lame excuse."

Azerbaijan

Four Azerbaijanis Killed in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD0807165191 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 8 Jul 91

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku July 8 TASS—Burned dead bodies of four residents of the Azerbaijani village of Syrkhavend were discovered on Sunday on the territory of neighbouring Askeran district in Nagorno- Karabakh. According to preliminary data, they were killed by firearms and then burned.

This crime, as is believed in the public relations centre of the Azerbaijani KGB, "was committed by an Armenian separatists group that is making active attempts to provoke a new spiral of the escalation of violence in Nagorno-Karabakh with a view to hindering the mounting positive processes in the Armenian community of that autonomous region of Azerbaijan."

The Azerbaijani procurator's office, the Interior Ministry and the republican KGB—in accordance with the Azerbaijani Parliament resolution demanding that law enforcement agencies take immediate measures to put a stop to extremists actions of Armenian militants on Azerbaijani territory—launched an operation to check compliance with passport regulations in a number of populated areas of Geranboy district, a spokesman at the public relations centre of the Azerbaijani KGB told the correspondent.

Several villages there were virtually turned into bases of bandit groups sent from the territory of neighbouring Armenia. From there, they made attacks on Azerbaijani populated areas, fired on civilians and servicemen and staged acts of sabotage on transport communications.

When law and order maintenance forces of Azerbaijan tried to enter the villages to check compliance with passport regulations, they were massively fired upon. Three militiamen were killed and ten militiamen and two KGB men were wounded. Gunmen used submachine-guns, grenade launchers, mortars and armoured vehicles.

Air reconnaissance spotted militants' numerous well-fortified firing positions and engineering constructions.

Azeri OMON Enters Shaumyan District

OW0807145491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1330 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A 300-strong Azeri OMON (special-purpose police) [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] unit entered the Shaumyan district of Azerbaijan to check on the passport regime, leading to clashes in the villages of Buzlukh, Manashid and Erkech between local residents and the OMON unit. According to Norutyun service news agency, two locals were killed and ten injured. Reports coming to Stepanakert say that the OMON units lost 2 men killed and 7 injured. 30 persons were captured including Azerbaijan's deputy Interior Minister Mamedov who was later handed over to Azerbaijan.

The fighting ended in the afternoon.

In comments on a statement by Armenia's deputy Lyudmila Arutyunyan, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoli Lukyanov said at the morning session of the Union parliament on Saturday that he had learned that a shoot-out was on between the Armenian and the Azeri villages in Nagorno-Karabakh. Lukyanov said that he had talked with the Nagorno-Karabakh residents, and their proposals had been made known to the Soviet and Azerbaijan's Presidents.

According to Lukyanov, he talked over the phone with the Armenian leader Levon Ter-Petrosyan Saturday mornng.

"Everything that can be done is being done," said the USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman.

Following the developments in the Shaumyan district, a telegram was sent from Nagorno-Karabakh to Moscow, addressed to the Soveit President Gorbachev, the RSFSR President Yeltsin and a number of commissions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The telegram says that the Azeri OMON's operations were undertaken to deport the Armenian population from the Shaumyan district. Nagorno-Karabakh authorities request the Union and Russian leadership to urge Azerbaijan to stop the actions it had started against the Armenian population of the Shaumyan district.

Kazakh, Tajik Presidents Discuss Union Treaty

PM0807144191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 91 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev in Alma-Ata and Kakhar Makhkamov, first secretary of Tajikistan's Communist Party Central Committee, in Dushanbe by PRAVDA correspondents G. Dildyayev and L. Makhkamov respectively; first paragraph is introduction; date not specified: "Union Treaty: Republics' Position"]

[Text] The draft Union treaty that has been published in the press has aroused extensive public interest. The republics' leaders talked about the hopes being pinned on it at PRAVDA correspondents' request.

We Ought Not Tarry Any Longer

[Dildyayev] The significance of the Union treaty for the country and the republic is so great that the latest session of the republic's Supreme Soviet that has just finished discussed and largely approved the latest version of the draft treaty on the union of sovereign states. Nursultan Abishevich, I liked the atmosphere in which this was discussed. One deputy even suggested thanking the drafters, even though extremely significant complaints and amendments were to be heard. Isn't that so?

[Nazarbayev] They do not cancel out the desire of the population of Kazakhstan to live within a renewed union. That is fundamental. At the same time I think that the parties to the treaty should be defined more clearly. Only the states that directly form the Union should be a party to this treaty. The autonomous formations within these states should sign the treaty as members of these states' delegations.

While supporting the idea of introducing a federal tax (otherwise the Union will be left without funds), we do at the same time dispute the mechanism for levying this tax that the Union Cabinet of Ministers proposed recently: All enterprises are mechanically taxed regardless of type and location. I think that the deformed economic structure in some Union republics, including Kazakhstan, should be taken into consideration when raising the federal tax. We need to correct the bias toward extractive sectors that developed over many decades of departmental diktat. The draft treaty enshrines the republics' right to ownership of the land, its minerals, and other natural resources....

[Dildyayev] Meanwhile property, including Union property, is already being reallocated. Various concerns have been set up. This has been described as nomenklatura-territorial privatization.

[Nazarbayev] We adopted a decision on transferring enterprises and organizations under Union jurisdiction to Kazakhstan's jurisdiction in order to halt this process. However, it would be a great mistake to see this as an attempt to mechanically supplant the center in managing enterprises. It is a question of granting Union enterprises some kind of "extradepartmental status" after taking them under our jurisdiction. Incidentally, we signed a kind of "communique" recently in Temirtau with the USSR ministers of metallurgy, the coal industry, and the radio industry on how to live with the republic's exercising real sovereignty. We therefore have our own view of the concept of "joint ownership" on republic territory that we will uphold in the definitive version and when signing the treaty.

However, all this is only a matter of details, albeit significant. The main thing is that the center's attitude toward its political role has changed radically as a result of joint efforts in the process of preparing the draft treaty. I think it necessary here to stress once again that the danger of losing the unified economic space and severing the links between the republics is not a propaganda invention put about in order to preserve the Union come what may but a harsh reality of our joint existence. To put it more simply, we cannot extricate ourselves from the current all-embracing crisis on our own. That is why we are so insistent in advocating the preservation of the Union on the basis of clear distribution of power between the center and the republics, particularly in the economic sphere.

[Dildyayev] Nursultan Abishevich, can you explain what is behind your proposal for a meeting of the leaders of all 15 Union republics, including those who refuse even to hear of their former status? What is to be discussed at this hypothetical meeting?

[Nazarbayev] The fact that no one will be dragging anyone into the Union. I suggest that we give up ideological disputes as to whether socialist choice is good or bad and whether we need the Union and try to resolve two highly acute problems together. First: Halt the fratricidal war that is blazing in the Transcaucasus. Second: Formulate means of escaping from the crisis, agreeing above all on restoring economic ties. Otherwise we will have a hard time this coming winter. To go on. We cannot do without foreign investment and technology. Therefore, when we meet we should support a plan for cooperation with the world community, above all with G-7. As for myself, from the very outset I backed the initiatives submitted by the group comprising Yavlinskiy, Primakov, and Shcherbakov.

Strange as it may seem, it is our current and potential foreign partners who are far greater champions of the Union treaty than certain home-bred politicians. That is no coincidence: The business world would like to do business with a single, strong Union state.

The adoption of a new Union treaty heralds a qualitatively new historical phase in the development of our multiethnic state, a phase of liberation from past dogma and transition to the civilized norms of human society. It would be no exaggeration to say that the treaty will represent another firm guarantee that the planet's political climate is getting warmer.

[Dildyayev] One last question. What brought about your unexpected request for republic parliamentary deputies to define their position: Are nationwide direct elections of the Kazakhstan president necessary or not now? Let us remind readers that you were elected to this post 14 months ago at a Supreme Soviet session for a six-year term.

[Nazarbayev] Talk of the need for nationwide presidential elections arises periodically. I understand it: There are people who reckon that these elections will enhance the republic's prestige. I am prepared for that. What is more, ahead of the implementation of important, hard decisions for Kazakhstan's residents, it is important to know whether my course has their support. Deputies reckoned that there is no need for elections.

Pooling Efforts

[L. Makhkamov] The Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session has just examined the draft of the new Union treaty. The overwhelming majority of deputies advocated the Tajik SSR's signing it. To what do you attribute this unanimity?

[K. Makhkamov] Not to what I think your question primarily imagines. The time has passed when republics unhesitatingly approved decisions "from above" and reacted uncritically to any new ideas "from there." There is plenty of evidence of that, including in Tajikistan.

The new Union treaty, in whose elaboration our plenipotentiary representatives also took an equal part, is not a "trial balloon" for politicians, over which they can compete in wit and ingenuity. It is the future of a great state, the future of dozens and dozens of peoples who inhabit one-sixth of the world's land mass. The first step on this road is supreme responsibility for decisionmaking.

In my view, the peoples of Tajikistan think extremely responsibly about their future: More than 96 percent of the population who took part in the all-Union Referendum favored preserving the USSR. Deputies did their duty to the voters. Although there were acute moments at the session when discussing some articles of the treaty, and an alternative version was even proposed....

[L. Makhkamov] In your view, which element plays the biggest part in the desire of Tajikistan's population to live within the Union—emotion, habit, or, excuse me, common-or-garden calculation?

[K. Makhkamov] I would not perhaps reduce everything to any one of these things. They have all equally influenced the choice but there are many other conditions that people cannot disregard. For instance, ours, like all the other republics, is a multiethnic republics, hundreds of thousands of non-Tajiks are entitled to consider Tajikistan their home. Add to that the vast number of interethnic marriages and their progeny.... The main thing is that the overwhelming majority of the Tajik population see no reason to leave the Union.

What is bad about someone really growing accustomed to living in the USSR? There are of course considerations of gain. First, it is not worth severing the Union's economic ties with the republics that have taken decades to develop, that is destructive for the actual republic that embarks on this. This is evidenced by the sorry experience of those people who failed to heed the warnings. Second, Tajikistan has for many decades, in conjunction with other Central Asian republics, conscientiously acted as a raw material link within the Union economy and, I think, we are entitled to expect the promised compensation for our losses. The time has come.

Third, our economic potential is still, I believe, of interest to many republics, not only in the form of cotton, but also other agricultural produce. Primarily thermophilic crops. The republic's natural environment affords superb prospects of organizing tourism and treatment and health institutions. Not to mention the truly countless riches of the natural storehouses in the Pamir and other mountainous regions—there are unique deposits of rare minerals there. We hope to gradually open these up with the help of the Union republics and for their sake.

[L. Makhkamov] Consequently, the interests of the republics and their peoples are still closely interconnected and the ties are still mutually beneficial?

[K. Makhkamov] Haven't we fully sensed all that today when these ties have begun to malfunction? I will cite a hackneyed example: The West, which is on the tip of everyone's tongue today, sees its future in unification, in integration.... But what about us? Are we going "our own" way again?

I am sure that we will have the sense and realism to preserve the Union. It is established fact and, once we have overcome the crisis, we will see for ourselves that it brings us together far more than it divides us.

[L. Makhkamov] The Supreme Soviet session approved you as head of the Tajik SSR plenipotentiary delegation formed to sign the new Union treaty. Before that you obviously have to uphold the republic's positions on certain contentious clauses....

[K. Makhkamov] Undoubtedly. Plenty of new proposals will have to be brought together after the Union republics have examined the treaty. From our viewpoint, the contentious clauses are, first, the clause of the treaty that restricts the republics' foreign economic autonomy, while giving the Union the right to coordinate the above republic powers and, second, Paragraph 2 of Article 3 of the treaty must obviously be removed. By and large we reckon that the speediest signing of the treaty on the Union of sovereign states will help the country overcome the economic, social, political, interethnic, environmental, and other clashes.

Authoritarian Trends in Central Asia Discussed

PM0507142691 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 24, 16-23 Jun 91 p 6

[Asal Azamova report: "Democratic Asia—Terra Incognita"]

[Text] Dushanbe-Bishkek-Moscow—The wave of bloody conflicts in Ferghana, Dushanbe, Osh and several other places has washed away the image of "prosperous" Soviet East. But, for readers in Europe, Central Asia is still terra incognita. Meanwhile, the weakening of the Centre's pressure and the gaining of sovereignty threaten today to allow the local apparat to become a dictatorship. Facing this danger, the democratic movements and parties and parties of Central Asia and Kazakhstan have joined to form a Regional Democratic Congress at their rallies in Dushanbe and Bishkek last May.

'Everything is quiet in Baghdad'

"This is how the supreme authorities want to present the situation in Turkmenia," said Khodzha Mukhammed, leader of the republican Democratic Party. "But this 'quietness' is achieved by tough measures taken against dissidents."

"Uzbekistan is on the threshold of an authoritarian dictatorship," says Abdurakhim Pulatov, co-chairman of the popular movement Birlik. Behind the words about the market and economic reform is the desire to preserve the party and administrative system. Illegal sackings, fines and arrests of Birlik's active members have become a common thing. Criminal cases are framed up against "disobedient" people's deputies.

The situation is the same in Tajikistan where a state of emergency remains in its capital after the events in February 1990. The representatives of democratic movements and parties of seven Republics, who got together in Dushanbe for a meeting, were not allowed by the authorities to lay flowers in the square near the building of the Party's Central Committee where blood was shed in February. The delegation was met by the "black berets"—the special militia (OMON).

At their session in late May participants in Democratic Congress sent telegrams to the Presidents of Uzbekistan and Turkmenia, demanding that an end be put to the persecutions of dissidents.

The new man in Bishkek

The situation in Kyrgyzstan is unique for Central Asia. The remaining command system is now headed by a president who is a democrat. Legally, the state and party power are separate. Most command posts are still in the hands of the party nomenklatura.

There is no official opposition in Kyrgyzstan. The Communist Party has declared its loyalty to the new leadership, but the opposition of conservatives and reformers—invisible to a stranger—continues. The efforts of President Askar Akayev and his team run against the disguised counteraction of nomenklatura which tries to retain the status quo.

"Our demands have been met, Akayev was elected President," says Kamilia Kenenbayeva, a board member of the Democratic Movement of Kyrgyzstan (DMK). The euphoria of hard-earned victory has passed and we find ourselves in a strange situation. Who are we going to fight? I can see only one way: the DMK, uniting 37 parties and movements, must undergo qualitative changes, find its place in the new balance of forces and give mass support to the government's reforms.

Is there such a party?

Bernard Shaw once said that democracy cannot rise higher than the material it is made of. Central Asian society, mostly rural inhabitants, is patriarchal in the way of life and thinking. Most of them can hardly tell the difference between conservatives and reformers. They are only concerned about vital problems of providing their large families with food and clothing. There is a deep gap between the mentality and way of life of villagers and intellectuals who headed national and democratic movements.

What is the aim of the opposition? Its banners with the truly magic word "sovereignty" bring together all kinds of forces, including those which even tentatively cannot be called democratic. Human rights, their priority over national and religious values, did not figure in the consciousness of the Central Asian peoples. And no wonder that the Uzbek Birlik (unity) and the Tajik Democratic Party, some movements of Kyrgyzstan, started from purely national demands.

The immaturity of political movements and parties is also displayed in the fact that many of its members are united not by a common programme but by non-acceptance of the existing power.

One of the active members of the Democratic Party of Tajikistan said bitterly: "If I were the communists, I would have yielded power to democrats of my own accord. And a year later the people would turn us out. We're not prepared to manage our affairs." These words can well be attributed to all Central Asian democratic groups without exception.

Unlike Russia, the Soviet East has never known a dissident movement. Intellectuals in Central Asia were much more obedient to the authorities. Today's opposition is the first over the past 50 years. Rising against traditions, the activists of movements are mostly experiencing not only the wrath of the authorities, but also public obstruction, and in some cases even the condemnation of relatives. Indeed, they are neophytes in politics with all the ensuing consequences. But the example of developing democratic movements in Russia gives them hope. The opposition has still much work to do in the parliamentary regime, which would step up its growth.

Hostages of empire and victims of national radicalism

The party nomenklatura in the Central Asian Republics is actively using the "Russian" card, dividing people by nationality. Activist of the Democratic Movement Natalya Ablova told how a year ago, before the elections, the entire Bishkek was swept by sinister rumours about forthcoming pogroms of Russians, rumours spread with the participation of party bodies. Only the joint appeal of the Kyrgyz Ashar movement, Demos political club and the voters' club, printed in the form of leaflets and pasted all over the city, relieved the tension.

In Dushanbe papers pulished only in the Tajik language information about the meeting of the leaders of democratic movements of Central Asia, Kazakhastan, Russia and Belorussia, whereas the Russian-language newspapers were "recommended" not to cover this event. Incidentally, during the February 1990 events all information over the republican TV was only in Tajik.

Many examples could be given of mass media ascribing Russophobia statements to the leaders and activists of democratic movements.

The so-called Russian-speaking population in national republics became hostages of the empire. The natives' strive for sovereignty excites apprehension among these people and they find it hard to give up the stereotypes of imperial thinking. And the movements too, laying great stress in their programmes on national revival, have alienated democratic-minded people representing other nationalities.

Mufti Removed From Central Asian Muslim Board

OW0807121891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Assembly of Muslim Communities held in Tashkent on July 5 has decided to remove Mufti Muhammad Sodik from his post as Chairman of the Central Asian Muslim Board. The leaders of the Uzbek popular movement BIRLIK (Unity) take the event as "a victory of the popular forces trying to put an end to state interference in religious affairs". Soviet Central Asia has a 55 million Muslim population.

The Mufti has been accused of "sacrilege": Under his order the books of Koran sent by Saudi Arabia to be distributed gratis among Soviet Muslims were put on sale at the price of 30-50 roubles. The pilgrims who have returned from their hajj to Mecca and Medina say they had an embarrassing talk with the Saudi leaders over the fact.

The Assembly also accused the Mufti of links with "certain state structures which had promoted him to office". He was reminded that his father had been an NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs] agent in Turkey.

This is a second attempt to get rid of the Mufti. The first one was made August 30 last year. The result was a dispersal of the assembly and a flat denial of the Mufti's removal. Muhammad Sodik is also a People's Deputy in the USSR Supreme Soviet. He was made the head of the Muslim Board in February 1989 at the age of 32, after his predecessor Shamsuddinhan Babahan was removed from office.

The Assembly has unanimously elected Abdelaziz Mansurov responsible for the department of Muslim Law as temporary Chairman of the Muslim Board. It has also set up a commission to investigate the Board's finances.

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Briefs Journalists on Union Treaty

LD0307192791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1521 GMT 3 Jul 91

[Text] A news conference by Nazarbeyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Kazakh Communist Party, and president of Kazakhstan, took place today in the Oktyabrskaya Hotel. Our special correspondent Kirill Shakhrovich is there now. He has just phoned us in the studio, and—over to you! Hello. Can you hear me?

[Shakhrovich] Yes. Good afternoon. Nursultan Abishevich Nazarbeyev said that the second meeting of the republics according to the Nine plus One format had just ended today. The talks were fruitful. In Kazakhstan, the stage of discussion the draft Union treaty in parliament has already passed, and Nazarbeyev has been instructed to sign the treaty.

Incidentally, there are some differences. These are, of course, connected with the republics' wish for more powers than the center. There are foreign currency operations, customs control, licensing, and a number of others. Speaking about other republics among the nine, Nazarbeyev said that the Ukraine will give its answer in September, while Russia will consider the matter in parliament on Friday. Delaying the treaty is simply very dangerous, in Nazarbeyev's view, bearing in mind the extent of the economic crisis, and here politics must enter into conflict with economics.

Nazarbeyev also recalled the negative pronouncements from the USSR Supreme Soviet concerning these Nine plus One talks. There is one strange small detail. At the news conference, one of the questions was asked by a journalist who introduced himself as a journalist from the radio station Nadezhda, which broadcasts in Russian in the Baltic region—but I know him personally as a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, so that position is evidently being maintained by the Supreme Soviet toward the talks of the nine.

Nazarbeyev also stressed the importance of the rapid signing of the treaty by the republics, and said that it was

impossible to emerge from the crisis individually owing to the breakdown of economic ties. It was simply deception.

President Nazarbayev's proposal for the 15 republics to meet without the center also remains on the table, and he is waiting for the republics to reply. Well, that will be a sort of second attempt, a parallel attempt, to find common ground between the republics, as there is nothing for them to divide up among themselves, and there are no serious contradictions between them.

Also discussed was the anticrisis program. Nazarbeyev called it progressive and market-oriented. Much in it is similar, in his view, to the 500 days program, which he has been actively supporting the entire time.

Answering journalists' questions about his attitude toward the statement by Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, and other leaders, he said that he knows thowse people. They will find a constructive principle, and Nazarbeyev is impressed by what was written in their program.

I will add that with regard to the block of laws adopted, Kazakhstan is the frontrunner in our country on the road toward the market. Judging by what the president said I realized, and it is already clear, that a great deal in that decisive and progressive economic policy is already now producing results for the inhabitants of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Incidentally, the president is also the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Kazakh Communist Party. In the Communist Party now, the apparat has been cut back by up to 70 percent. There are none of the secretaries who used to run the economy. All their command functions have been handed over to the soviets. But the main thing is that the Kazakh Communist Party does not oppose the broad and radical market reform that is taking place within the republic.

I will give you further details in our later program.

Nazarbayev Advocates Direct Loans to Republics

AU0807142391 Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT in German 8 Jul 91 p 8

[Bernd Ziesemer report: "Financial Credits From the West Should Be Directly Granted to the Republics"]

[Text] Moscow—According to the president of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, Western credits should be granted directly to the individual republics in the future. The governments of the individual republics should assume the guarantees for specific financing projects, the Soviet politician stated in an interview with HANDELSBLATT.

The 51-year-old Nazarbayev is probably the most important Soviet politician after Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin at the moment. The president of the second-largest republic increasingly assumed the role of a mediator between Yeltsin and Gorbachev in the talks on the new Union treaty. As a Politburo member and first secretary of the Communist Party in Kazakhstan, Nazarbayev, who is an engineer by profession, can rely on considerable support within the CPSU. He is considered an advocate of the "South Korean model." He governs Kazakhstan like a dictator, but favors the quick introduction of the market economy. His economic advisers include the former prime minister of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, and the U.S. economics professor Chan Young Bang.

Apart from Yeltsin and Gorbachev, Nazarbayev is the only politician who was involved from the beginning in the drafting of the so-called Javlinskiy Plan for the G-7 meeting. The president of Kazakhstan sees "good chances" for the realization of a radical economic reform in the Soviet Union.

There are "no big differences" between the ideas of Grigoriy Javlinskiy and the anticrisis program adopted by the Soviet Government, he said. After the economic summit, "further changes and amendments" to the government program will be required. However, basically, the Javlinskiy Plan is compatible with the anticrisis program. The most important thing now is to ensure the internal convertibility of the ruble.

"We have already started to introduce the market economy," Nazarbayev stressed. The delivery of Western goods is extremely important during the current transition period to ensure a minimum supply of the population. In the president's view, financial aid should primarily be provided to two areas: modernization of consumer goods production and improvement of enterprises that produce export goods. Money for these projects may also be granted to the central government, but direct agreements with the republics are "more expedient," he said. "We need Western investment to accelerate the production of raw materials," Nazarbayev added. Kazakhstan is currently holding talks with the U.S. oil company Chevron on the joint exploration of oil and oil production in the Tengis area in the north of the republic.

According to Nazarbayev, Kazakhstan hopes for "special relations" with the FRG. About 900,000 ethnic Germans still live in the central Asian republic. For this reason, direct economic contacts with Kazakhstan were agreed on during recent visits by German economic delegations, the president pointed out.

The republic's wealth in raw materials might form the basis of cooperation with German companies. Unfortunately, there have been no direct German investments in Kazakhstan, Nazarbayev stated. Some specific proposals by German enterprises are currently being examined.

The Soviet politician spoke in favor of further disarmament, but he is against a far-reaching reduction of the Soviet weapons industry at this point. "We want to have a strong army and modern weapons in the future as well," Nazarbayev pointed out. However, in its present size the army is "simply too expensive for us." For this reason, the Soviet Armed Forces must be reduced, converted, and modernized. The president would like to end the nuclear tests that have been carried out on Kazakh territory. "We have done our duty for the fatherland for the past 40 years."